THE VNERR[illegible]

[illegible]: AND [illegible]

VNERRABLE CHVRCH

OR

An anſvver to a Sermon preached by Mr Andrevv Sall, formerly a Ieſuit, and novv a Miniſter of the Proteſtant Church.

VVritten by I.S. and DEDICATED TO HIS EXCELLENCY The moſt honorable Arthur Earl of Eſſex Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Anno 1675.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY;

THE MOST HONORABLE

ARTHVR EARL OF ESSEX,

VISCOVNT MALDEN,

Baron Capel of Hadham, Lord Lieutenant General, and General Gouernor of his Maiesties Kingdom of Ireland, Lord Lieutenant of the County of Hertford, and one of the Lords of his Maiesties most honorable Priuy Council.

MY LORD;

I present vnto your Exllency a vindication of both Churchs, vvhich a viper has endeauoured to byte, that the Catholick has bred in her bosom; to follovv the

Truth (if vve believe him) he forsooke all that vvas Deare vnto him, he might haue vsed that phrase of S. Peter since that vvhat he had to forsake, vvas but Net-lyke; *but iustly may vvee think he expected from Your Excellency, as S. Peter had from Christ, a return of a* Seat; *not such as Peter obtained, but as the children of Zebedee did pretend. But your Excellency, vvhose Decrees are liuing Eechos of the* Royal *sentiments, vvill adiudge him rather a* Chalice *to drink, than a Seat to exalt him; a* Chalice, *I say, such as the Royal Piety of King Iames prescribed to those of his blasphemous opinion, in the meeting of his Clergy at* Southampton: VVee detest in this point the cruelty of the Puritans, and iudge them vvorthy of fyre, vvho affirm, that in the Popish Religion a man may not be saued.

My Lord, all sober men of both Religions desire the execution of this sentence, against this impious assertion, pronounced in your

Excellencies hearing, and giuen vnto you in print (to profane both your eares, and eyes vvith a repeated blaſphemy) by a late Reuolted from our Church, and that, not only for a reuenge of the iniury don to your Excellency in particular, in adiudging your Noble Anceſtors (vvho allmoſt all dyed in that Profeſſion) vnto Hell; nor for condemning his ovvn to the like miſery, (if, for being of the ſimple ſort, he vvill not plead for their ſaluation) but for the iniury don to Chriſtian Piety, to vvhich that Poſition is contrary in the iudgment of all learned Proteſtants.

But vvhat makes this execrable Poſition vnpardonable in our Aduerſary, is that his ovvn vvords accuſe him to ſpeake againſt his conſcience: pag. 116. he ſaies, Their Tenets are inconſiſtent vvith ſaluation, though ignorance may haply excuſe many of the ſimple ſort, but not ſuch as knovv, or vvith due care and enquiry, may knovv their error. *By this he*

excludes all VVyse men of our Profession from saluation, and affords it only to the simple sort, or those vvho haue an inuincible ignorance. That herein he speakes against his conscience, its most apparent; for in his discourse he often styles Thomas Aquinas a Saint; the first Reformers, and Passionat Sectaries degraded the Saints of their Canonization; but Mr Sall, as yet, retains the respect due to their glorious memory. VVhatever he might say of others, he knovvs vvell that S. Thomas Aquinas vvas of the Roman Religion, a fryer of S. Dominicks Orders; None of the simple sort, or that could be inuincibly ignorant, being vvell vers'd in Scripture and an Eminent Master in most sciences: He believed, professed, and taught our Tenets of Real Presence, Purgatory, &c. He vvas then in Mr Salls iudgment a Saint reigning in Heauen, and at the same tyme is condemned by him to hell, because he believed and professed Tenets inconsi-

ſtents *vvith ſaluation: is not this to ſpeake againſt his conſcience?*

He had vvit, My Lord, to vnderſtand, he could not iuſtify his ſeparation from our Church, if in our Church there vvas not ſomvvhat, inconſiſtent vvith ſaluation: for to ſeparat from the true Church, vnder pretence of her being guilty of ſom errors, and of reforming her, by purging her from thoſe errors, if the errors be not quite damnable, and inconſiſtent vvith ſaluation, is ſo far from being lavvfull, that ſuch Reformers cannot be excuſed from Schiſm: All things ſhould be endured (*ſaies S. Denis of Alexan. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.*) rather, than to conſent to the diuiſion of the Church of God; *and ſaies Iren. l. 4. cont. Heret. c. 62.* No ſo important Reformation can be made, as the Euil of Schiſm is pernicious, *for if thoſe Errors be conſiſtent vvith ſaluation, then they are no neceſſary cauſe obliging to a ſeparation; the ſeparation from the*

true Church is Schismatical and damnable, vvhen there is no need, or necessary cause for separating; consequently, to separat from the true Church for Errors vvhich are consistent vvith saluation is a most damnable Schism. Mr Sall felt, perhaps, the force of this consideration, and to iustify his separation from the Church vttered that horrid blasphemy of errors in her inconsistent vvith saluation.

May it please, Your Excellency to consider vvhat an iniury he does to your cause in seeking to iustify it by an assertion so contrary to your Church, and so odious to your Excellencies Piety, That there is no saluation in the Catholik Church, That her errors are inconsistent vvith saluation. *It's far from your Excellencies Piety to believe that S.* Thomas Aquinas, *admired by the VVord for his learning and sanctity, vvas condemn'd to Hell, and yet he believed and taught the* Real Presence *of Christ's Body in the Sacrament;*

it's therefore no error inconsistent with salvation. Your Excellencie will not believe that S. Augustin is in Hell, who professed and taught the Tenet of Purgatorie, as appears in his Ench. c. 119. lib. 9. Conf. c. 13. and lib. de Hæres. c. 53. where he condemns Aetius as an Heretick, for denying sacrifice should be offered for the dead. Purgatory therefore is no Error inconsistent with salvation: Your Excellencie will not patiently heare any man to say that S. Hierom is eternally damn'd, and yet he thaught the veneration and use of the sign of the Cross Epist. ad Dem. and the veneration of Relicks of Saints lib. cont. Vigil. S. Chrysostom praied and exhorted to pray to Saints Hom. 43. in Gen. Hom. 5. & 8. in Mat. and must wee say that Chrysostom is damn'd to Hell? These are the Errors, which Mr Sall affirms to be inconsistent with Salvation; These are the Tenets, in whose Profession he sayes, no Wyse and Learned Man can be saved,

impiously condemning to Hell the fore-mentioned Saints vvhich the Christian VVorld reueres for the Pillars of the Church, and not only them but all VVyse men Seculars and Eccleſiaſtick of all precedent ages to Luther, if inuincible ignorance did not excuſe them, vvhich they could not pretend, nor can vvee imagin they could haue, being the moſt learned Doctors of Gods Church.

If this Treatiſe did contain nothing elſe but a check of this rash and impious aſſertion, it vvould not be vngratefull to your Excellencie; but had I left any thing vnexamined of vvhat he treats in his diſcourſe, he vvould interpret my ſilence his ovvn Victory, and flattering himſelf vvith a fond perſvvaſion of the euidence of his arguments, vvould think vnanſvverable, vvhatsoeuer vvere not anſvvered. And though he touches but lightly the Controuerſy of the Neceſſity of an infallible liuing iudge of Controuerſies, yet for the reſpect I ovvn to

Your Excellencie I endeauour to fathom this queſtion. I ſay for the reſpect I owe to your Excellency, *for vvanting nothing to an accomplisht happineſs vnder your Exc*y*'s Gouernment*, *but* Vnity *of ſubiects in* Faith *and* Communion, *the greateſt obligation I can caſt on them, and teſtimony of my Duty I can exhibit vnto your Excellency, is to ſhevv, by vvhat means vvee may attain to that* Vnity; *vvhich is no other, than a liuing infailible Iudge, from vvhom vvee are to receiue the true ſence of Scripture. I vvish my endeauors may be as ſucceſsfull, as my inclinations are reall to ſhevv my ſelf in all occaſions,*

MY LORD,

Your Excellencies moſt Humble,
and faithfull ſeruant, I. S.

THE PREFACE.

IF Mens *vvills* were inclined to embrace the Truth, as their *vnderſtandings* are inſtructed to perceiue it, wee might ſpare our labor in writing, and cut ſhort the number of Controuerſy Books that the world is glutted with. It's inclination is wanting to the *vvill*, not inſtruction to the *vnderſtanding*. Nature prouided, the *vnderſtanding* ſhould direct the *vvill*: That *This* ſhould neither loue nor hate; but as *That* ſhould repreſent the obiect worthy of hatred or loue: but the malice of Man has prepoſterously inuerted this order: now its not the practice, that the *vvill* loue, what the *vnderſtanding* knows to be good; but the *vvill*, byaſs'd by Intereſt, or other wordly conſiderations, doth incline, and in a manner force the *vnderſtanding* by the violence of our Paſſions, to adiudge for Good (let it be what it will) watheuer ſuits beſt with her depraued inclinations. Hence there are as many Religions in the State, as there are Intereſts; that byaſs the Subiects: wee

should therefore lay our pens alyde; and by a constant addresse of our prayers to God, begg his Grace for to reform the *vvill*, which with the cloud of her disordered Passions darkens our Reason, and lessen our Transgressions, which slumber our minds: for certainly it's not light that is wanting in so learned an age, but sinsabound which indispose our eyes to see in.

But whylst our Aduersaries decry our Religion, with such a stream of Pamphets, as floweth dayly from the Press; shall wee by our silence starue our Cause, and make it suspected of weakness, in giuing some ground by our mutenes, to think it cannot be defended? or shall wee spare a little Inke to defend, what wee are obliged to assert with our blood? This hath moued me to write this Treatise; and that as some receiue better nourishment from grosser meats, than from delicat fare; it may happen, that some one may meet with these lynes, and receiue more spiritual nourishment from them, though rudely worded, and in a plain style, than from the learned Treatises eloquently penned by others. Being *a Debtor* (with S. Paul) *to the vvyse and vnvvise*, I endeauor to

satisfy, *Them*, with the strength of my Reasons; and *These* by stooping to vulgar expressions, and sometymes to Periods which might be well omitted, if only Men of quick Apprehensions were to reade what I write, to open my sence to those of common vnderstanding.

What chiefly hath moued me to publish these lynes, was the dismal fall, of Mr Andrew Sall; a *Iesuit*, and a Professor of Diuinity and Controuersies, as he tells vs, all which qualifications, if true, makes his Reuolt from the Church more criminal. He desires he may be answered seriously and soberly setting a syde all bitternes, calumnies and railleries, all which he shall easily obtain of me, far from insulting ouer any Christian for his weaknes; but rather drawing from it a caution for my own safety. I am not of the seuere opinion of those *seruants*, who would pluck out presently the Tares, which budded in the field of Corn Mat. 13. but aduised by the *Master* of the field to forbeare with patience; *Zizania dimitti iussit*, (sayes S. Chrysost. hom 30. in 9 Mat. *vt pœnitentiæ locus daretur*. He commanded the *Tares* should not be touched, that there might be tyme for repentance: Because, as. S. Auguf. sales

ſerm. 46. *etiam ipſa Zizania ſæpe in tritic. cum mutantur.* Perhaps that which now is *Tare*, may by the kindneſs of the ſoyle, and celeſtial influence become *wheate*; which Experience hath often shewen to be a holſom aduice; wheras many that haue fallen, haue by Gods Mercy recouered, and by repentance been rayſed to a higher degree of Sanctity, than the Innocent attained vnto, who neuer did fall. And if it be true (what he ſayes) that ſome haue aſperſed him with baſe calumnies, and laid ambush for his lyfe; I am ſo far from approuing that practice that I think it an effect of inſolency and pride, which blinds them not to conſider their own fraylty, and what they may be: wee ought rather to pitty his misfortune, and prayſe God, that has not ſuffered vs to ſplit on the ſame Rock: and ſince wee do not know, but that by Gods mercy, he may be reclaimed, why should wee vpbraid him Phariſee-lyke, whom, for ought wee know, God has deſigned to make by a generous conuerſion and acknowledgment of his errour, ſuperior to vs in his Glory?

This iuſt moderation shall guide my pen, neither can Mr Sall iuſtly complain that I exceed it, in letting the world know that

he ſpreads too much his Talents and imployments in empty Titles, nay and fictitious ones. *Profeſſor of Moral Theology in the Royal Colledge of Salamanca*; no more than in withe Hall at London. *Profeſſor of Controuerſies in the Irish Colledge of Salamanca*, and his Auditory compoſed of *Spaniards' french* and *Irish*. No controuerſies taught in that Colledge, nor has not been theſe forty years: and how vnlikly it is to be true, what he ſayes, may appeare, in that he ſayes his Auditory was compoſed of *Spaniards*, a People that cannot endure any diſpute of the Principles of Religion, altogether ſtrangers to matters of Controuerſy: and of *frenchmen*; and it is as hard to find a *french* Studiant in the vniuerſity of *Salamanca*, or any other of Spain, as a Swallow in winter, eſpecially that when Mr Sall was in Salamanca, the war betwixt *France* and *Spain* was very hot, and lykly they muſt haue got a Safe-conduct to go to be Mr Salls Schollers. *Profeſſor of Diuinity* in *Pamplona Tudela* and *Palencia in Spain*. In the Colledges of *Tudela* and *Palencia* there is not nor was there at any tyme *Diuinity* taught: in *Pamplona*, indeed he was Profeſſor of Diuinity, for one or two years; and had they been as

content

content of him, as he was of himself, he would haue continued many more. *Rector of the Irish Colledge* he was; an imployment that requires no more than a mediocrity of discretion to gouern half a dozen Lads peaceably; and I know not was it a greater credit for him to haue been in that imployement, than to haue been cast out of it before the yeares end, when others continued it for three years at least, and commonly for 6. or eight years. As for other things that might be said, I will take no notice of them.

And euen from this moderat reprehension of his vanity, I would haue willingly abstained, did he not oblige me to it. For I appeale to the Protestant Reader, whether it be not fit, that when he pretends by fictitious Titles to gain credit to his cause, and to his arguments with the vulgar People, I should open their eyes, to see that he is not, what he sayes he is. The Priests and Leuits, sent by the Iews to the great Baptist, to know what he was Io. 1. made him two very different questions; *VVhat are you; VVhat do yo say of yourself*; Knowing that often tyms, there is a vast difference betwixt *vvhat a man really is*, and *vvhat he sayes he is*. And this neuer appeared more

apparently, than in the great difference that is, betwixt what Mr *Sall is*, and what he ſayes *he is*. And it is very important for the truth of the cauſe which I defend, that the Reader take notice of this difference: for wyſe men, dot not ſo much conſider the quality of the perſon that ſpeakes, as what he ſpeakes; and value not an argument, for his ſake who propoſes it, but for its own merit: But Men of vulgar capacity, who do not vnderſtand the ſtrength or weakneſs of an argument; value it not for what it is in itſelf; but for the learning and credit of the Perſon, that propoſes it whence it is, that men of common vnderſtanding, who know not the weakneſs of Mr Salls arguments, will, not withſtanding, believe them to be very pregnant, becauſe they are of a man of that vogue and credit, which he moſt vniuſtly vſurpes, of a *great Diuine*, a *Venerable Rector*, and *Profeſſor of Diuinity*: ſo that the moſt dangerous weapon wherewith he attacks vs, is his credit and Authority, which belongs not to him. If he were content to fight vs with his arguments; wee would be content with a bare anſwer, for vpon the learned men they would neuer make any impreſſion; nor vpon the vnlearned, who to value an

argument, only looks on the Proponent: but when he comes to fight vs, in the shape of a very learned Diuine, and a great Maſter in Sciences; wee muſt vnmask his ignorance and vanity, leaſt his arguments, which in themſelues haue no force, aſſiſted with that vſurped credit and authority, may work on the Spirits of ignorant People.

Perhaps this Treatiſe may ſeeme larger, than might be thought neceſſary for an anſwer to M. Salls diſcourſe: I confeſs it is; and were I to conſider only what his diſcourſe deſerues, it required no anſwer; for it contains nothing but what has been ſaid twenty tymes and anſwered ſo many more: though, this being the firſt Eſſay of this great Diuine in fauor of Proteſtancy, its ſtrang if he were ſo learned as he would haue vs belieue him to be, but that it should be an exquiſit peece: yet I haue thought fit to anſwer it, and do intend not only an anſwer to him, which could haue been don in fewer lynes, but an exact diſcuſſion of the Points he toucheth, and particularly of that prime and great Controuerſy of which depends the reſolution of all others, The infallibility of a liuing Iudge of Controuerſies, which is the Church. Therefore, for a full ſatisfaction of thoſe that deſire

to know and embrace truth I diuide this Treatiſe into two Parts; in the firſt I will proue the Neceſſity of a liuing infallible Iudge of Controuerſies, and proue it to be the Roman Catholik Church. In the ſecond I will examin thoſe pretẽded Errors, which he faſtens on our Church; and will endeauor to leaue nothing vnanſwered that he obiects againſt vs, though I may prepone or poſtpone his arguments as the Methode of my diſcourſe requires. If my labor proue to your ſpiritual aduantage, I am ſufficiently rewarded; if not, I shall not want a reward from him that crowns good deſires, farewell.

Your friend in Chriſt Ieſus
I. S.

THE

THE FIRST PART PROVING the neceſſity of an infallible liuing Iudge.

1. CHAPTER.

BVT ONLY ONE TRVE RELIGION. The need full Means afforded by God to come to the knovv legde of it.

THAT God is to be adored, it's the voice of Nature, pronounced by all Nations: Reaſon proues it; for were you yourſelf the chiefeſt in Power, the higheſt in Dignity, the Richeſt and moſt adorned in virtues, in the Common wealth; you would expect an Homage, and it could not be denied vnto you by your Inferiors. Confeſs then, that a far greater is due from you to God; whoſe Power is ſupereminent; his Wiſdom tranſcendent; his Goodneſs vnlimi-

ted, his Perfections innumerable. But it is not arbitrary to Man, to adore God with what manner of Worship his fancy ſuggeſts vnto him; or his priuat ſpirit inclins him vnto. God, as he requires a Worship at our hands, ſo he has himſelf reuealed, what manner of Worship he requires. Perdiſcamus (ſayes S. Chryſoſt. hom. 51. in Mat.) *Chriſtum ex ſua voluntate honorare; nam qui honoratur, eo maxime honore lætatur, quem ipſe vult, non quem nos optamus.* What ſacrifices, Rites, and Ceremonies, God would be adored with in the old law, he declared it to his People by Moyſes Leuit. from the firſt, to the 7. chap. and declared that he would not be otherwiſe worshipped Leuit. 10. In the law of Grace, his ſon Incarnated, abolished that Ceremonial law; and reuealed to Mankind a new manner of diuine worship, a new Sacrifice, Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies; by which he will be worshipped, and by no other: in ſo much that by S. Paul Gal. 1. 9. he commands, that if an Angel from heauen should recommend vnto vs an other manner of diuine worship, wee should not heed him.

This worship of God, reuealed by him to Man, is true Religion; worship him euer

ſo much, if you do not adore him, as he has reuealed he would be worshipped, you haue not true Religion. That there is a true Religion extant, it's doubtleſs, both for that wee pretend each of vs, his own Religion to be the true one; and that God has laid a command vpon vs, and wee are obliged to worship him in ſpirit and Truth (this is Religion) which command and obligation ſuppoſes the *Exiſtence* of a Religion. That among all thoſe Religions, wherwith the world abounds, there is but one true Religion, (whateuer, and whereuer it be) its alſo manifeſt; for true Religion is that manner of diuine worship, which God has reuealed; but God has not reuealed thoſe ſeueral manners of diuine worship, which do oppoſe and contradict one an other: if it be he that reuealed wee should worship him by denying the *Meſſias*, as the Iewdoes; certainly it muſt not be he that reuealed wee muſt worship him by believing in the Meſſias as the Chriſtians do: conſequently both thoſe Religions of Iudaiſm and Chriſtianity muſt not be true Religions. If it be he that commanded, wee should worship him by believing the real Preſence of Chriſt his Body in the *Euchariſt*; certainly its not he that comman-

ded, wee should worship him by denying the real presence, for that would be to contradict himself: therefore of all those Religions, which clash one with an other, only one must be the true Religion.

This is further proued: No Religion, wherin God is duely worshipped, and a man may be saued; can iustly be called, an *accursed*, *heretical*, and *damnable* Religion; this Position is euident: (consequently it appears how vniustly Protestants call the Catholik Religion, *Idolatrous* and *superistitious*; it being by their own acknowledgment as wee will proue against Mr Sall, a religion wherin wee may be saued and consequently wherin God is duely worshipped) But S. Paul in expres tearms, does anathematise, accurse and condemn all and each Religion, (euen those that are Christian Religions) besids that one, which he and his fellow Apostles did teach; *if vvee* (Gal. 1. 9.) *or an Angel from Heauen, should Euangelize vnto you, othervvyse than as vvee haue don, let him be accursed:* pursuant to which doctrin, Hymenæus, Philetus and others, declining som what the doctrin of the Apostles, in the Article of the *Resurrection of the Body*, not absolutly denying it, but saying it was already past 1. Tim. 1. 20.

and 2. Tim. 2. 18. they ſtill remayned within the verge of Chriſtianity, but becauſe by their error in that Article only, they were of a different Religion from that of S. Paul, he delivers them to Satan, calls them *creeping Cankers* and *ſubuertors of the Faith*; which would haue been a manifeſt iniuſtice in him, if they ſtiil remayned in a true Religion, where God was duely worshipped: it follows therfore that no other, euen Chriſtian Religion, is a true Religion, but that one which S. Paul profeſſed and from which they departed.

And if any Chriſtian Religion, with a good Moral lyfe were ſufficient for ſaluation, the Prelats and Paſtors of the Church in all ages are to be laught at, for their continual care of keeping their flock in vnity of Faith and doctrin, wheras any Religion was ſufficient with a good Moral lyfe, the General Councils were moſt rash and impious in condemming Arrius Neſtorius, and other heretiks, wheras they ſtill remained Chriſtians, and the lyues of many of them were moſt iuſt and vpright as S. Auguſtin teſtifies of the Pelagians. Let the Libertins then, of our age be vndeceiued, who to ſecure their intereſt and ambition are ready to embrace any Religion.

that is the moſt preualent in the ſtate; for all (though Chriſtians) Religions but that one which S. Paul profeſſed; all but that, whoſe vnity the Prelats and Concils did endeauor to preſerue, are accurſed, hereticall and impious.

Now ſince of all Religions, that only is the true, which God has revealed vnto vs; and that no other worship will pleaſe him; doubtleſs he has afforded vs the needfull and ſufficient means, to know what Religion it is, and to diſtinguish it from other pretended Religions which he has not reuealed. Without Faith and Religion it is impoſſible to be ſaued; God therfore who deſires our ſaluation, and commands vs vnder pain of damnation to haue true Faith, muſt haue prouided vs of the means neceſſary to attain to true Faith. Let vs examin what Faith is: It's an Aſſent giuen to an obiect, for the teſtimony of him that propoſes it: it is therefore grounded on the Authority of the Proponent; and can haue no more aſſurance of the Truth, than the teſtimony on which it is grounded as for example *Human Faith*, wherwith I believe what a Man of credit and knowen honeſty tells me, can haue no more certainty, than the credit and honeſty of that

Man has: and wheras Men, let them be few or many in Number, vſing only natural means, may deceiue or be deceiued; either in the teſtimony they giue, or in the grounds of their Aſſertion; be it the euidence of their ſenſes, (which are ſubiect to fallacy) or the euidence of their Natural reaſon (for ſom times, reaſons that ſeeme to vs euident, are but ſophiſtries) it is manifeſt that human Faith, which relyes only, on the teſtimony of men, is fallible: for though it may happen, that *de facto* it is true, and that there may be moral certainty of its being true; yet abſolutly it might be otherwyſe, and ſo the Faith grounded vpon it is ſtill fallible.

But diuine Faith; That Aſſent which Gods requires of vs to reuealed Truths, muſt be an infallible *Faith*, which not only is true, but cannot be otherwiſe than true; it muſt be a firm Aſſent in the higheſt degree of certainty, excluding all doubts and feare of being miſtaken: and wheras Faith has no other aſſurance of the Truth, than the Authority of the Proponent, it follows that diuine Faith muſt rely vpon a moſt infallible vndoubted Authority, which can not deceiue or be deceiued. Hence it follows that no euidence of ſen-

ſes, (for our ſenſations are deceitfull) can be a ſufficient ground for diuine Faith, nor no natural reaſon; for if it be probable, or only morally euident; it may be falſe, or falſified; if abſolutly euident; it can be no ground of *Faith*, becauſe Faith being *an argument of things not appearing*, as S. Paul ſaies, it ſurpaſſes natural reaſon: and becauſe that if it be euident, it forces the vnderſtanding to an Aſſent, and ſo leaues no place for the merit of *Faith* which conſiſts in believing what the vnderſtanding may deny, becauſe of the difficultie it finds in aſſenting to an obſcure obiect; which the *vvill* aſſiſted with the *pious inclination ouercomes*, and thereby merits. No Hiſtories nor doctrin of Fathers, no teſtimony or authority of any fallible Church or congregation, is ſufficient, becauſe diuine *Faith* being infallibly certain muſt be grounded vpon an infallible Authority. Laſtly it follows, that only the infallible written word of God, or the authority of an infallible Church, muſt be it, which propoſes vnto vs the reuealed Truths, and on which wee muſt bottom our Faith.

Let vs heare what Mr Sall ſaies as to this particular: he was once of opinion that Scripture alone was not the

means appointed by God for propoſing vnto vs the reuealed Truths, their ſence not being obuious euen to learned men, and conſequently not the means ſuitable to vulgar capacityes, who being, as well as the learned, obliged to belieue, the means for attaining to the knowledge of Religion muſt be ſuitable to their capacity, as well as to that of the learned; and Scripture through the difficulty of it ſurpaſſes both: therefore, it became the Goodneſs and Wiſdom of God, to appoint a viſible Iudge, aſſiſted with his infallible ſpirit, that in caſe of doubt ſhould determin our controuerſies, and declare vnto vs what we ought to belieue. *But*, ſaies he, pag. 27. *the* Archbishop of Cashell obiecting, *that vve ought to be very vvary in cenſuring the VViſdom of God, if this or that vvas not don in the gouernment of the vvorld, vvhich ſeemeth to vs good to be don; the Modeſty of the Proponent added ſuch vveight to this aduertiſment that it touched me to the quick, and reflecting on this point in my ſolitudes, I ſavv ſaies he, vvee might as vvell ſay that it belongeth to the goodneſs of God, not to permit that his holy lavves ſhould be tranſgreſſed by vile creatures; nor that the Paſtors of ſouls, eſpecially the Pope, ſhould ſcandalize their flock and*

as vvee do not iudge it a failure in his goodneſs to permit ſins; ſo vvee ought not vvauer in our opinion of his goodneſs and VViſdom, if he has not appointed a viſible Iudge for our direction, hauing giuen us the holy Scriptures, vvhich a bound vvith all light and heauenly doctrin, to ſuch as are not vvillfully obſtinat.

Briefly, Sr, heere are three different opinions of Chriſt's preſence in the Sacrament, Catholik, Lutheran, and Proteſtant: of the three quite oppoſit one to the other, God has reuealed but one as I for merly diſcourſed; and obliges me vnder pain of damnation to belieue that ſence and no other; I ſay *under pain of damnation*, for ſaid he, *if you vvill not eate the flesh of the ſon of Man and drink his bloud, you shall not haue lyfe in you.* Io. 6. muſt I not expect of Gods goodneſs that he will afford vnto me what is abſolutly need full to acquit this obligation? he abſolutly requires of me to belieue that ſence, and no other of thoſe three which he reuealed: muſt I not then expect of his goodneſs ſome means to aſcertain me which of thoſe three different opinion is that which he reuealed? would it be conſiſtent with his goodneſs to oblige me vnder pain of damnation to flye to the Moon, and afford me no wings

(which wee ſuppoſe are indiſpenſably need full) for to acquit that obligation? The Aſſent which he requires at my hands, is not a probable and dubious one; but an Aſſent which renders me aſſured, in the higheſt degree of certainty, of the Truth I profeſs; ſuch and no other is diuine Faith: ſuch an Aſſent is impoſſible if there be not an infallible Authority on which it is grounded; which you Proteſtants cannot deny, for its therefore you reiect Tradition, and will admit no other Teſt of Faith but the written word of God, becauſe Faith muſt be grounded vpon an infallible Authority, you ſay, and Tradition is fallible and nothing infallible but Gods written word. if Scripture were not written by the Apoſtles, could not you ſay without any iniury to God, that it became his wiſdom to afford you ſome other infallible Authority, wheras without ſuch an authority it's impoſſible to haue the Aſſent of Faith which he requires? and was it not therfore that he gaue to his Apoſtles who preached to the primitiue Chriſtians, the credit of infallible Oracles, becauſe then there was no Scripture written nor any other Authority wherupon to bottom their Faith, but the teſtimony of the Apo-

ſtles ? Since therfore wee do manifeſtly proue that Scripture alone is not ſufficient to determin Controuerſies, and inſtruct vs what wee are bound to belieue, let not your inſtructors *Modeſty* take it ill that wee ſay it becomes the goodneſs of God to appoint a liuing infallible Iudge on whoſe teſtimony and authority wee may rely and ground our Faith. Vvee ſay with St Auguſtin l. de vtil. cred. ad Honorat. *Si Prouidentia Dei non præſidet rebus humanis, nihil eſt de religione ſatagendum. Si autem præſidet non eſt deſperandum ab eodem ipſo Deo, authoritatem aliquam conſtitutam eſſe qua velut gradu certo attolamur ad Deum. If Gods Prouidence gouerns not the vvorld, vvee need not be ſollicitous of Religion; but if Prouidence rules all, it cannot be doubted but that God has appointed an authority, by vvhich, as by a certain aſſured vvay vvee may be lead to God.* Vvee muſt therefore grant ſuch an Authority (which is not Scripture as wee will proue) or deny Prouidence.

Your inſtance is very weake, and vn becoming ſo great a diuine as you profeſs to be; Gods goodneſs cannot be queſtioned for permitting ſins and the ſcandals of Popes; nay it's becoming his goodneſs to permit them; for hauing created Man

with perfect liberty for to work well or ill, it becomes his goodneſs to giue him all that is needfull for the exercyſe of that liberty; and Man could not exercyſe it (if wee did not pretend to ſome extraordinary miraculous Prouidence for which wee haue no ground in Scripture nor reaſon, and to which his goodneſs cannot oblige him) if he did not permit him to ſin: and to queſtion God why his goodneſs doth permit ſin, is to ask why he created Man with perfect liberty? which if you do, I anſwer; becauſe he gaue him liberty that he might vſe it well; and if he vſes it ill; its his own fault.

VVee ought not, ſay you, *to vvauer in our opinion of Gods goodneſs for not appointing a Liuing infallible Iudge, vvheras he has afforded us the Scriptures vvhich abound vvith all heauenly light to them, that are not vvillfully obſtinat*: and this you proue 2. Tim. 3. 16. *Holy Scriptures are able to make us vvyſe vnto ſaluation, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furniſhed unto all good vvorks*. But I infer to the contrary: wheras the Scriptures, though replenished they be with heauenly light, are not ſufficient for to declare vnto vs what wee ought to belieue; wee might waner in our opinion

of Gods goodneſs, if he did not appoint an infallible liuing Iudge for to inſtruct vs: and that the Scriptures are not ſufficient for the inſtruction of them *that are not vvillfully blind*. Mr Sall himſelf proues it; for pag. 17. he tells vs that doubting of the Tenets of our Religion, his wit not content with an *ipſe dixit* lyke *Pythagoras* his ſcholler, demanded Reaſon for what he belieued: he betooke himſelf to the frequent reading of Scripture: but, Sr, if you be not content with an *ipſe dixit*, you are as vnfit for Chriſt's ſchoole, as for that of *Pythagoras*, and if your wit demands reaſon for what you belieue, Scripture is no place to ſeeke for it, which affords nothing but a bare *ipſe dixit*. After reading the Scriptures, he was ſo far from being ſufficiently inſtructed, that he confeſſes they made him doubt: whence it appears, that Scripture alone is not ſufficient euen to thoſe that are not *vvillfully blind*, he was no ſuch, for he did read with a real deſire of being inſtructed.

The text of S. Paul ſayes *that Scripture is able to make us vvyſe to ſalvation*; but does noy ſay, that *Scripture alone* is able: if you will haue text to be for your purpoſe, you muſt follow the example of Luther, who

to proue his error of iuſtification by *Faith only*, corrupted the text of S. Paul Rom. 2 8. *vvee account a man to be iuſtified by Faith, vvithout the vvorks of the lavv*: and foiſted in the word *Faith alone*. 2. S. Paul in that text ſpeaks only of the Scripture wherin Timothie was verſed, and which he had peruſed from his Youth, which was only the Old Teſtament: ſo that if the text proues the ſufficiency of the Scripture for our inſtruction, it proues the ſufficiency of the Old Teſtament only. 3. S. Paul in that vers ch. v. 14. ſayes to Timothie, *thou continue in thoſe things thou haſt learned, and are committed to thee knovving from vvhom thou haſt learned them*. Whence its apparent that he remitted Timothie for inſtruction, to the Scripture and alſo to the doctrin deliuered to him by a liuing Oracle, which was the Apoſtle himſelf. Laſtly the whole Canon of Scripture was not compleated when S. Paul writ that text, nor in many years after; and you can not pretend that euer wee had the ſufficient means for our inſtruction in any part, but in the whole and entyre Canon; therefore you cannot pretend that that text doth proue the ſufficiency of Scripture.

II. CHAPT.

SCRIPTVRE ALONE, NOT THE Means for to inſtruct vs in Faith.

IF Scripture alone, were the means appointed by God for to declare vnto vs what wee ought to belieue; is it not ſtrange, that Chriſt should not himſelf haue left vs a Written word to walk by, when he laid vpon vs the obligation of embracing true Religion; or that he should not, at leaſt, haue laid a Command vpon his Apoſtles of deliuering vs a written word? reade the whole Canon, and you shall find no ſuch command: but he left Apoſtles and Paſtors, and a command vpon them, to *teach* and *preach* vnto vs; and vpon vs of belieuing and obeying them; which argues that the means which he deſigned for our inſtruction in Religion, was not a written word, but a liuing Church. *Neceſsity is laid upon me, yea vvo is vnto me if I preach not the Ghoſpel.* 1.Cor. 9. 16. He feared no *vvo* for not *vvriting*, but for not *preaching* the Ghoſpel; becauſe he would depriue the flock of the means which God appointed

appointed for their inſtruction. And the Channel by which Faith is conueyed vnto vs being our *Eares*, *fides ex auditu*, and not our *Eyes*, it ſeems apparent, that the means which he appointed is a liuing Oracle who ſpeaks, and not a volum which wee reade.

But let vs ſuppoſe that the Apoſtles did by ſpecial command of Chriſt write the Ghoſpel: this is manifeſt, that ſince the very beginning of the Church, Chriſtians did doubt, which was the true Scripture written by the Apoſtles and which not: there is not one part of all Scripture but was queſtioned and denied by ſome Chriſtians to be Canonical: Cerdon the Valentinians, and Manichæans denyed the Old Teſtament to be Scripture. Epiph. Hær. 41. The Ebionits reiected the four great Prophets, the Books of Salamon and Pſalms of Dauid. Epiph. Hær. 30. Marcionits reiected all the Ghoſpels except that of S. Luke. idem Hær. 42. and Irer. l. 1. c. 6. the Ebionits did own only that of S. Mathew. They alſo reiected the Epiſtles of S. Paul Epiph. Hær. 30. And the Diſciples of Cerdon would not belieue the Acts of the Apoſtles Tert. de Præſcrip. c. 51. The Lutherans this day blot out of the Canon the Epiſtle of S. Paul to

the Hebrews, as also that of Iude, the second of S. Peter and second and Third of S. Iohn, all which the Caluinists believe. The Church of England will not admit the Books of Machabees, Esther Iudith and others, which the Chatolik Church admits: nor did the Ancient Fathers of the Church proue against the Marcionists and other Hereticks those Books to be Scripture by the Scripture itself, but by the Church as S. Augustin l. cont. Epist. Man. c. 5. *Euangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiæ commoueret Authoritas: I vvould not believe the Ghospel to be the Ghospel, if the authoriiy of the Church did not moue me to it.*

Now I argue thus: you say true Religion is knowen by Scripture alone; that's to say, wee haue no assurance of a Truths being a reuealed Truth but by Scripture alone. Therfore wee can haue no more assurance of a Truths being a reuealed Truth, than wee haue of the Scriptur's (which contains that Truth) being true Scripture: if therefore you be not innfallibly ascertained that this is true Scripture, you cannot be infallibly ascertained that the Truths which it contains are reuealed Truths: But Scripture alone giues no assurance that it is true Scripture; that it is not corrupted

either by the malice or ignorance of the translators, or inaduertency of the Printer; for there is not a text in all Scripture that mentions it: therfore the Scripture alone cannot ascertain vs of the Truth of Religion. And it cannot be imagined but that, since the true sence of Scripture is doubtfull, God has prouided vs of some means to know which is the true sence; so also since that wee are obliged to believe with diuine Faith, that this Booke is Scripture; it cannot be doubted I say, but that God has afforded some means for to ascertain vs which is true Scripture, and to confound those that deny the Scripture to be Scripture. But Scripture itself alone can neuer assure vs of its being Scripture.

For to say that Scripture doth manifest itself to be Gods word by certain *Criteria*, or signs found in Scripture itself, as a *diuine beam of light*, *a Maiesty of style*, an *energy of words*, wherby it does manifest it self to the humble and well intentioned harts to be Gods word; these are but fond imaginations: for all the Ancient Fathers of the first 402. years of the Church, doubtless were as humble, and as well intentioned as wee, and all that tyme the Epistle

of S. Paul to the Hebrews, Iude and S. Peeters ſecond Epiſtle, and ſecond and Third of S. Iohn were not belieued, as an article of Faith to be Scripture; nay were abſolutly denyed to be ſuch, by Tert. Cypr. Lactan. and others; and yet they had the ſame Majeſty of ſtyle, and energy of words, as now they haue: and whateuer you may iudge of vs Catholiks, Luther, you will ſay, was humble and well intentioned, and could ſee no ſuch *Criteria* or ſigns in thoſe Epiſtles, which Caluin belieues to be Canonical, and 'tis but a fond imagination to conceit any ſuch luſtre or Majeſty in thoſe Books, which you belieue, more than in the Books of Tobias, Eſther and others which you deny. Conſider, I pray, if a Pagan deſirous of his ſaluation, were placed in a vaſt Library, could he diſtinguish the Scripture from other Books, and know it to be the word of God, only by reading it: and if you did euer reade, of any Kingdom couerted to Chriſtianity by reading the Bible only, without Apoſtolical men to expound the Chriſtian Doctrin, and by that you may gneſs, which were the means appointed by God for our inſtruction, if Scripture alone, or a liuing Church.

And allowed wee be aſſured this Book

and no other is the word of God: of the Scripture wee may say, what S. Paul said of the Lords supper: This if worthily taken is life and saluation; if vnworthily is damation: if Scripture be vnderstood in the true sence intended by the Holy Ghost, it leads to true Religion, if vnderstood in the wrong sence, it leads to perdition, as S. Peter sayes, 2. epist. 3. 16 speaking of the Epistles of S. Paul, *the vnlearned and vnstable depraue them, as the rest of the Scripture, to their perdition; by misunderstanding them.* Grant this volum to be the word of God: the words of it may be, and are interpreted in diuerse and quite opposit sences; as that command of Christ, *he that vvill not eat the flesh of the son of Man, and drink his bloud, shall not haue lyfe in him*; it is interpreted in three opposit sences by Lutherans, Catholiks, and Protestants; and it is euident that Christ intended only one of the three sences: wee are bound vnder pain of damnation to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, in that sence, which he intended, and no other will suffice: the Scripture alone does not assure vs, which of those three sences, is that which Christ intended: for wee haue all the Scripture, wee read it, wee study, wee pray, and wee cannot agree

in the ſence of thoſe words. either therefore there muſt be ſomwhat elſe beſeids Scripture, for to aſſure vs of the true ſence of it; or God has left vs with an obligation of belieuing and not afforded vs the ſufficient means for to aſcertain vs, what he will haue vs to belieue.

To ſay that God giues an inward light, and teſtimony of the ſpirit to the humble and well diſpoſed harts, which aſſures them the ſence which they hold of the Scripture is the true ſence, is a groundleſs fancy, exploded euen by the modern Proteſtants; wheras thoſe illuminated perſons cannot be aſſured if that inward light be an illumination from God, or an illuſion of Satan often transfigured into an Angel of light: our Controuerſiſts haue fully refuted this foolish fancy; I only add that if the means appointed by God to aſſure us of the true ſence of Scripture, be that inward light and teſtimony of the priuat ſpirit, God has afforded no means for to keepe vs in vnity of Faith; for there are as many different lights and teſtimonies of the ſpirit, as there be men almoſt, and ſo his houſe will not be a houſe of peace, but of confuſion: and if that be the true ſence of Scripture, which the inward

light and teſtimony of each mans ſpirit does ſuggeſt; thoſe lights and inward teſtimonies of the ſpirit being quite contradictorily oppoſit one to the other; it follows that the H. G. intended quite oppoſit ſences in each text of Scripture: Nor could any man reaſonably pretend to perſuade an other to be of his religion; for ſince he has no aſſurance of the truth of his Religion, but what he has by that inward light and ſpirit, how can he in reaſon go about to perſuade me, that his light and ſpirit is true, rather than that which I haue my ſelf: ſo each man muſt be content to haue his Religion to himſelf, and ſeeke no other to be of it. S. Iohn 1. Epiſt. 4. 11. bids vs not to believe euery ſpirit; but to try it; and in that very ch: directs vs to a touch ſtone wherat to try our ſpirits, *He that knowveth God heareth vs; he that is not of God heareth vs not: in this vvee knowv the ſpirit of Truth, and the ſpirit of Error.* If your ſpirit, heares and obeyes the Paſtors and Prelats of the Church, your ſpirit is *of Truth, in this vvee knowv the ſpirit of Truth in hearing vs, not in reading vs.* If your ſpirit will not heare the Church, but prefer it ſelf before the ſpirit of the Paſtors and Prelats of the Church; your ſpirit is of

error. The means therefore to distinguish spirits, to know the truth, and the true sence of Scripture, is not Scripture it self, nor your inward light but the Church, which is the approuer or reprouer of spirits.

The Modern Protestants haue found out an other way for to defend the sufficiency of Scripture, for to vnderstand by it alone the true sence of it: for, say they, though some text or texts of Scripture be obscure, yet comparing them with other texts, they are expounded, and the true sence found by the scripture alone comparing one text with an other; especially in what concerns the fundamental points of Religion necessary for saluation, which are easily found, and cleerly set down in Scripture. Mr Sall. pag. 105. of his discourse seems to be of this opinion; saying, *that all necessary knowvlegde for Faith in God, to serue and prayse him, is fully contained in vvhat is cleer of Scripture.*

There is nothing more cleer, than that the Holy Scriptures are most obscure, euen in points necessary for saluation; the obscurity consisting in the hight of the Misteries it contains, in the difficulty of its phrases, in the seemingly contradictions

it contains; that the moſt learned men that euer were in the Church found it a task too great for their vnderſtandings to expound it: learned Proteſtants themſelues do confeſs it, and our Controuerſists haue ſo euidenced it, that it were a ſuperfluous labor to proue it: that only text of ſaint Peter 2. epiſt. 3. ch. which I quoted but now, ſufficiently proues it; and that no text nor texts of ſcripture compared doth declare ſufficiently euen the fundamental points of our Religion, two inſtances do cleerly euidence.

Firſt Gods *Vnity* in *Nature*, and *Trinity* in *Perſons* in all Chriſtians acknowledgment is a fundamental article of Religion: wee belieue he is *One* not in *Perſon*, but in *Nature*; wee belieue he is *Three*, not in *Nature*, but in *Perſons*. And what text or texts compared one with an other can you bring to shew this Miſtery? Let the diſpute be betwixt a Proteſtant, an Arrian, and a Pagan: ſuppoſe the Pagan confeſſes and agrees with both, that the ſcripture is the word of God; but will not admit that either the Proteſtant or Arrian is infallible in the interpretation of it: how will the Proteſtant proue againſt the Pagan, that God is *One* in *Nature*, and Three in Perſons? He will

alleadgē out of ſaint Iohn 1. ep. 5. *the Father the ſon, and the ſpirit, and theſe Three are One.* the word *One* ſignifies *Vnity* in *Nature*, and the word *Three Trinity* in *Perſons*: But ſayes the Pagan, that is againſt all reaſon, and the principles of Philoſophy, that *Three* diſtinct *Perſons* ſhould haue but *One Nature*; and though I do belieue the word of God to be infallibly true euen in what ſurpaſſes my reaſon, yet I will not belieue againſt my reaſon but what the word of God does aſſuredly ſay; and that text which you alleadge does only ſay they are *One*, but does not expreſs, if that *Vnity* be in *Nature* or in *Perſon*, nor doeth the text expreſs that the *Trinity* is in *Perſons* and not in *Nature*: nay the Arrian, who is a Chriſtian as well as you, ſaieth, that text ſignifies no ſuch *Vnity* of *Nature*, and *Trinity* of *Perſons*: and in your own confeſſion, Chriſt is *One ſuppoſitum* or *Hypoſtaſis*: his *Vnity* is not in *Nature*, (for he has *Tvvo Natures*, one *Human*, and the other *Diuine*) but in *Perſon*; why may not wee alſo ſay, that the father, ſon, and ſpirit, are *One*, and that their vnity is not in *Nature* but in *Perſon*? whither will the Proteſtant go now, to proue againſt the Pagan this great, and fundamental article? He will quote out of

ſaint Iohn an other text for to expound the former; *My father, and I are one*, 10.10, 20. where it is expreſſed that the Father and ſon who are *twvo* different *Perſons*, are but *One* in *Nature*: But, replieth the Pagan, neither does that text ſay more, but that they are *One*, and does not expreſs, either that they are *twvo* diſtinct *Perſons*, or *one Nature*.

And ſayes the Pagan, bring you as many texts as you pleaſe, you will neuer bring any, which expreſly declares the *Vnity* to be in *Nature*, and *Trinity* in *Perſons*; and I muſt not renounce reaſon ſo far, as to belieue a Miſtery, which no human reaſon can vnſterſtand; particularly, when you require of me, to belieue only what the word of God expreſſy declares; and the word of God, which you alleadge does not expreſly declare that Miſtery, nor doeth the word of God oblige me to belieue your interpretation of thoſe texts: I heare the *Arrians* and *Sabellians*, who are Chriſtians as well as you, and they, with their Abettors, (who are not fewer in number nor inferiour in learning to you) ſay, thoſe texts which you alleadge do not at all import any *Vnity* in *Nature*, or *Trinity* in *Perſons*: for the *Sabellians* ſay, the word

One in thoſe texts ſignifies *Vnity* in *Perſon* as well as in *Nature*; and the word *Three* ſignifies, not Three diſtinct Perſons, but one and the ſame Perſon, called by three different names, for three ſeueral Offices, which he does exerciſe: *Father* becauſe he is the Author of all things; *Son* becauſe he was born to redeem vs; and *Holy Ghoſt*, becauſe he ſanctifies vs: euen as, ſay they, theſe three ſeueral names, *Immenſe*, *Omnipotent*, and *Eternal* ſignify *One* and the ſame God, who includes the perfections ſignified by thoſe names.

Arrius and his partizans vnderſtand thoſe texts in a far different ſence from you Proteſtant: the word *Three* ſaies *Arrius* ſignifies three different *Natures*, which *Arrius* proues with a text, far more pertinent in appearence, than that which you Proteſtants alleadge to proue the *Vnity* of *Nature*, S. Io. 14. 28. *My father is greater than I*; which text, deliuered without any reſtriction, ſaies Arrius, proues the ſon to be of a different and inferior Nature to the Father. The word *One* ſaies he, does not ſignify the *Vnity* of *Three Perſons* in *Nature*; but their *Vnity* by perfect conformity of *Vvill* and *Charity*; which expoſition he proues by S. Io. 17. 11. where Chriſt

praying for his Elect, asketh his Father, *they may be one, as vvee are One:* but certainly the Elect cannot be *One* in Nature, nor did he ask any such *Vnity* for them; but that they should be *One* by perfect Charity and conformity of *vvill* therefore the *Father* and the *Son* are not otherwise *One.*

Thus the Pagan to the Protestants, and adds; I believe the Scripture to be the word of God, because he has revealed it vnto me; I am resolved to be a Christian; but I know not which party to embrace, the Protestant; or the Arrian; you will haue me believe Gods *Vnity* in Nature and *Trinity* in Persons; and though that Mistery surpasses human reason, I am content to submit vnto it, if I did find it expresly in Scripture; but those texts either singlely or all together do not expresly declare it; as I iudge and as the Arrians and Sabellians who are Christians, as well as you, iudge; and on the other side you do not require of me to believe, but what is expresly contained in Scripture. what shall I do in this case? You say it is expresly contained in those texts; but am I bound to believe it is contained in them, because you think it is? the Scripture does not tell me that I am bound to believe what you think,

rather than what the Arrians think is contained in it: if I ſyde with the Arrians, you ſay I am damned: if I ſyde with you the Arrians ſay I am damned; and why to ſyde with one, rather than the other, I know not; for you are of equal authority, as to me; both learned, pious, wiſe people, and well verſed in Scripture. You tell me the Arrians are condemned by General Councils; Arrians and Sabellians alſo, tell me you are condemned by ſeueral Councils, in the points you hold in oppoſition to the Catholicks; you ſay the Councils and Ancient Fathers, who condemned you did err, and were miſtaken in the ſence of Scripture: the Arrians and Sabellians alſo, ſay the Councils which condemned them, did err: you ſay the Miſtery of the Trinity is vnanimously belieued by Proteſtants and Roman Catholiks: but I ask, what credit hath the Roman and Proteſtant Church? haue you the credit of infallible Oracles, by which God ſpeakes, or haue you only the credit of wiſe, learned pious men? if the firſt; that indeed is ſomewhat, and ends all Controuerſy: if only the ſecond, the Arrians, Sabellians, Heathen and Pagan Philoſophers, are as numerous as you, as learned, wiſe, and, as to moral honeſty, as

good as you, and they all deny that Myſtery.

Can any man of reaſon, ſay, this Pagan in this occaſion, is obliged to ſide with the Proteſtants, rather than with the Arrians? they both haue Scripture, they are all Chriſtians, they reade and ſtudy it, they are both fallible in the interpretation of it; and that either of both is effectually miſtaken in this caſe, its manifeſt: and which of them it is, this Man has no imaginable means to be aſſured of. Now if God has appointed a liuing infallible Iudge, to interpret, and deliuer the true ſence of Scripture; this Pagan could not but be obliged to acquieſce to his interpretation; whence its is manifeſt that Scripture alone is not ſufficient for to aſcertain vs of the true ſence of Scripture, euen in fundamental points.

An other inſtance to proue this truth: there is a point of Faith, which we are obliged to belieue vnder pain of damnation, which is not expreſſed in any text or texts compared of Scripture alone, whitout an infallible interpreter. I do not meane the Neceſſity of Infants Baptiſm, nor the Validity of Heretiks Baptiſm, belieued by both Churches, and for which, ſaies S. Auguſtin l. 1. cont. creſc. c. 32. *there can be no example*

brought out holy of Scripture. I proue it thus: Wee Catholiks and you Proteſtants diſpute, if Purgatory be a fundamental point of Religion or not? If it be; its a damnable error, to ſay it is not; both for that errors againſt fundamental points are damnable, as you confeſs, and for that to deny for fundamental, that which is a fundamental Truth reuealed by God, is to diminish of the word of God; by which you deſerue to be blotted out of the Book of life; Apoc. 22. If it be not a fundamental point; it is a damnable error to ſay it is; for that would be to add to the word of God; which alſo deſerues to be blotted out of the Book of life: conſequently in this our conteſt, wee are indiſpenſably obliged to belieue, either that it is, or that it is not: nor can wee ſuſpend our Iudgment, but muſt reſolue abſolutly on either ſide. but no text or texts of Scripture do declare, if it be, or be not a fundamental article of Faith, if not expounded by ſome infallible interpreter: therefore Scripture alone is not ſufficient, for to aſſure vs what wee are obliged to belieue.

III. CHAPT.

THE SAME ASSERTION proued.

LOoke back to the Infancy of the Church, for the first eight or tenn years; there was not a word of the New Testament written; and the last part, (whatsoeuer that part was, wherin the Doctors do not agree) was not written in 40. years after Christ his Ascension: part of the Scripture, after it was written did perish; for example an Epistle of S. Paul to the Corinthians mentioned 1. Cor. 5. 9. by which wee vnderstand that he writ three epistles to them, whereof two only are extant: also part of the old Testament was lost, as appears Chron. 9. 12. and 29. Nay this very Scripture that now is extant, and owned by vs all to be Canonical, for the first 402. was not (a good part of it) owned to be such; for the Fathers of the Church disputed, and many denyed S. Pauls epistle to the Hebr. Iudes epist. second of saint Peter, second and Third of saint Iohn to be Canonical; consequently they could

not be the Teſt of Faith; becauſe they were not believed to be Scripture. all this tyme, as there was an obligation vpon Chriſtians to believe, ſo they had the ſufficient means, for to know what they were obliged to believe; which was not Scripture, becauſe either it was not written, or if written, it was not all, (as now it is) believed to be Scripture: therefore God muſt haue appointed ſome other means beſids Scripture, for to inſtruct vs in Religion.

And if you inſiſt, that the Scripture, as now it is extant, is the needfull and ſufficient means for our inſtruction, I infer; therefore wee had not the needfull and ſufficient means, vntill all this Scripture now extant was written; conſequently the Church, was for many years without the ſufficient means for inſtruction: I infer again; therefore vntill the laſt text of Scripture was written, wee had not the ſufficient means; and wheras you are bound to proue by a cleer text, that Scripture alone is the ſufficient means, it muſt be with the laſt text of all ſcripture you muſt proue it: for then, and no ſooner, was the ſcripture the ſufficient means, when the whole Canon was completed, and the laſt text was written; and this is impoſſible to be

proued. alſo it follows, that you muſt not pretend to proue the ſufficiency of ſcripture by any text of the new or old Teſtament, written before the laſt text; wheras the whole Canon was not completed, when thoſe texts were written; and conſequently they could not proue the ſufficiency of ſcripture which in your acknowledgment did not begin to be the ſufficient means, vntill the Canon was finisht. Moreouer if the ſcripture, as now it is extant, be the needfull and ſufficient means; then the Lutherans, whom you receiue to your Communion, and embrace as Brethren, haue not the ſufficient means for diuine Faith, (and conſequently nor Faith itſelf) wheras they deny many parts of Scripture to be Canonical, which you belieue.

But what moſt cleerly proues that Scripture, as now it is extant, is not the ſufficient and needfull means, is this diſcourſe; firſt its not the *needfull* means, for if a very conſiderable part of this Scripture did perish, wee would ſtill haue the ſufficient means, in what would remain of Scripture, to inſtruct vs in what wee are bound to belieue; for what wee are bound to belieue vnder pain of damnation, are only the

essential and fundamental points of Religion; whoeuer believes them, though he denies other points not *fundamental*, and *inferior* Truths, in the doctrin of Protestants, believes what is sufficient for his saluation; but there are many chapters, or at least half chapters, or at least many verses of Scripture, which do not in the least mention any essential and fundamental point of Religion; therefore all those chapters and verses are not needfull for to know what wee are bound to believe; and if they did all perish, wee would in what remained, haue the sufficient means. Now that Scripture as now it is extant, is not the *sufficient* means, I proue it: for if any part of Scripture be the sufficient means, it must be that part, which contains the fundamental and essential articles of Religion; and wheras you do not know, nor could any of your Doctors euer yet (though often desired by vs) giue a Catalogue of those, which you call fundamental points, which they be, and how are they distinguisht from not fundamental points; its impossible that you can tell which part of Scripture is that, which contains the the fundamental points of Religion, and consequently you cannot tell which

part of ſcripture in the *ſufficient* for our inſtruction.

That the Church was the means appointed by God for our inſtruction, before the ſcripture was written, the Proteſtant do not, nor cannot deny: and if they will not wauer in their Principles, they muſt confeſs it continued ſo, vntill the whole Canon was finisht; (which was not vntill many years after Chriſt his Aſcenſion:) But, ſay they, ſcripure being written, which doubteleſs God gaue vnto vs, for no other end, than to be our guide and rule of Faith, the Church ſurceaſed from that office, and is not to be regarded further, than as she agrees with that written word: ſo that after ſcripture was receiued for Gods written Oracle, the Church was casheered out of thoſe glorious offices, which formerly she enioyed: becauſe (as our Aduerſaries pretend) there was no need of any other infallible Oracle, but the ſcripture, which in the iudgment of all is ſuch. If this diſcourſe be good; it proues alſo, that the Apoſtles ceaſed to be our inſtructors, and infallible Oracles after the ſcripture was written; and that the Church ceaſed to be infallible in fundamental points, becauſe the ſcripture is an infallible oracle, contains

all points, and one infallible Oracle is ſufficient: yet our Aduerſaries confeſs that the Apoſtles remained ſtill infallible; and the Church in fundamental points.

And, wheras all ſcripture was not written at once, but ſucceſſiuly by parts; the Church was not deueſted of teaching vs, but by degrees, as the parts of ſcripture were written; which paradox, though ridiculous, follows out of the former diſcourſe. But what if part, or all the ſcripture did perish; which is not impoſſible, both becauſe that ſome part of it has perisht already, and that there is nor in all ſcripture, any promiſs of its perpetuity, as there is of the perpetuity of the Church: then, I hope the ſcripture would return to her ancient prerogatiue of being the needfull means appointed for our inſtruction: this extrauagant poſition you are bound to affirm, and you can shew no ſcripture for it, and yet you can belieue nothing but what is in ſcripture.

I should think this a good diſcourſe: the Church was once our guide, and means appointed to aſcertain vs of the truths when the ſcripture that now is extant, was not written: But the ſcripture now owned for ſuch, does not ſay, the Church was

deueſted of that Prerogatiue; therefore I am ſtill obliged to belieue she enioyeth it: for the obligation that once was, and it not proued to be abolished remains ſtill in force: there was an obligation of belieuing the Church to be Gods infallible Oracle; nothing appears, that taketh away that obligation: therefore its ſtill in force.

To conclude, the Neceſſity of an interpreter beſides Scripture, for to inſtruct vs what wee are to belieue, is proued, not only, becauſe Chriſt did place Apoſtles, Euangeliſt, Doctors and Paſtors in his Church, Eph. 4. 11. for this end, as the Apoſtle diſtinctly faies, for to keep vs in *Vnity* of Faith, to inſtruct vs, *that vvee may be no more Children vvauering to and fro and carried avvay vvith euery vvind of doctrin.* but alſo by the practice of the Catholik and Proteſtant Churchs, who giue ſuch vaſt reuenews to Eccleſiaſtical perſons for teaching the flock, and expounding the Myſteries of Faith; if ſcripture were ſo cleer in the neceſſary points, what needed any more, but to giue each one a Bible, and imploy the Rents of the Clergy in ſome other vſe? what needed ſo many authentick Chriſtian doctrins published by both Churchs for to declare the Myſteries of Religion? what

needed ſo many Volums and Commentaries of the Fathers vpon the ſcripture, if it alone is cleer, full, and plain in what wee are bound to believe?

IV. CHAPTER.

A TRVE CHVRCH ESTABLISHED by Chriſt to decide Controuerſies, and deliuer the true Doctrin vvhich vvee are bound to believe.

NO Proteſtant, at leaſt of our tymes, will deny the exiſtence of a true Church, it being an article of the Apoſtles Creed, *I believe the holy Catholik Church.* The true Notion of it, wee haue from S. Paul Rom. 12. 4. by a compariſon of it with a Natural Body: as this hath ſeueral members, each one wherof hath its proper function; ſo wee all, as ſo many different members, which exerciſe diverſe functions, concurr to conſtitute one Body in Chriſt. In the natural Body, there is a head, which is the ſeat of the Iudgment which gouerns; there are eyes to ſee, ears to heare, a mouth to ſpeake: hands to work and feet to walk: thus in the Church,

Chriſt's myſtical Body; there muſt be a head to gouern, which is the ſuprem Paſtor; there muſt be eyes to pry, and examin the truth; and theſe are the Doctors; there muſt be hands to deliuer the word of God, and a mouth to ſpeake; and theſe are the Preachers, Paſtors and Curats, there muſt be eares to heare and feet to walk which are the flock. Hence wee gather the true Notion of the Church of God to be a viſible ſociety of true belieuers, under one ſuprem Paſtor, where the Faith of Chriſt is taught and belieued.

The Church therefore is conſtituted of two parts, the *One* whoſe obligation is to teach and rule the flock: the *other* whoſe obligation is to obey and belieue what the Church by her Paſtors and Doctors does teach and command; and wheras the Church was ſtill extant (or the article of our Creed was ſome tyme falſe) it follows, there were ſtill extant Paſtors, and Doctors, who did teach the true Faith of Chriſt, and a flock that belieued it. As to the obligation of the Church to inſtruct and gouern vs, theſe texts of ſcripture euince it: *Neceſsity is laid vpon me for to preach, and vvo be to me if I preach not.* 1. Cor. 9. 16. *Attend to yourſelues and to the vvhole flock, vvherin*

the H. G. has placed you Bishops to rule the Church of God. Act. 20. 23. Which obligation was layd an the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors, when Chriſt commanded them *to teach all Nations, to preach the Ghoſpel vnto all creatures:* which obligation S Paul doth in ſeueral places of his Epiſtles declare, but particularly Eph. 4. 11. *He placed in his Church, ſom Apoſtles, and ſom Prophets, others ſom Euangeliſts, others ſom Paſtors, and Doctors*, and declares to what end did Chriſt prouide his Church of them: *for the conſummation of Saints into the vvork of the Miniſtery; that vvee may meet in the vnity of Faith, that vvee be no more children vvauering to and fro, and carried avvay vvith euery vvind of Doctrin.* Whence two conſequences follow; the firſt that if you be toſſed in your mind, and doubtfull what to belieue; if *twvo Sacraments* or *ſeauen*; if *real Preſence* or *figuratiue*; you are not to be carried away with euery wind of Doctrin; but go the Church, which God has furniſhed with Doctors Apſtoles, and Paſtors for to inſtruct you: the ſecond conſequence; that Chriſt Faith being but *One*, and wee obliged to liue in the *Vnity* of that Faith, the Apoſtle tells vs in this text, that the means which he has appointed for to keepe vs in

Vnity of Faith, are the Apoſtles, Euangeliſts, Doctors and Paſtors of the Church, that the Church by them may lead vs to the *profeſſion of one Faith.*

The other part which cõſtitutes the Church, is the flock, whoſe obligation is to obey and beliue what she by her Doctors and Paſtors does teach and command vs: this obligation is manifeſtly proued Mat. 23. 2. *all, that they, vvho ſit on the chayr of Moyſes, vvill ſay vnto you, that obſerue and do.* Lu. 10. 16. Chriſt commands, that he who will not heare the Church, is to be eſteemed a *Heathen* and a *Publican*, and adds that *he vvho deſpeiſeth her, deſpeiſeth him*; that is to ſay he that deſpeiſeth her Doctrin, which S. Paul expounds 1. Theſ. 4. 8. when after giuing them inſtructions, he ſaies. *He that deſpeiſeth theſe things, deſpeiſeth not man, but God: and* 2. Theſ. 3. 14. *he that obeyeth not our vvord, do not acompagny him, that he may be confounded.* Theſe cleer and manifeſt texts proue the obligation of the flock to beliue, and obey the Doctrin, and commands, which the Church by her Paſtors and Doctors layeth vpon them. Whence it appears that the Church is the Oracle, and Miſtreſs, which Chriſt has appointed on earth for to inſtruct and gouern vs.

This diſcourſe that the Church is conſtituted of two parts, the one whoſe obligation is to teach and gouern, the other whoſe obligation is to learn, belieue and obey, is cleerly shewen in the 1. Cor. 3. where the Apoſtle compares the Paſtors and Prelats to Husband men, who ſoweth the ſeed, and to Maſterbuilders that make a houſe; and compares the flock to a field that receiues the ſeed and improuments, and to an edifice. But, ſaies he, *He that planteh, and he that vvatereth are one*, and *euery man shall receiue his ovvn revvard according his ovvn vvorks; vvee are labourers together vvith God, ye are Gods Husbandry, ye are Gods building.* All is but *one* body, *one* commonwealth but with this diſtinction, that ſome in this Body and commonweath, are *labourers*, ſome whoſe charge it is to *plant*, and *ſovv* the ſeed, which are the Apoſtles, and their ſucceſſors: others are the *Husbandry*, the field which is *vvatered*, and receiues the ſeed, whichs the flock.

Out of theſe Premiſſes I diſcourſe thus: as it is impoſſible that God, laying an obligation vpon vs of belieuing reuealed Truths, should not haue afforded vs the neceſſary means to know what Truths he has reuealed; ſo it is a madneſs in me to expect to

come to that knowledge by any other way or means, than by that which God has appointed for our conduct. it's an vnqueſtionable truth, that God might haue eſtabliſhed an other manner of Prouidence for the ſaluation of man whitout Scripture Sacraments or Church; but if God has decreed in this his preſent gouernment, not to ſaue Man but vpon certain conditions, will you be ſo peremptory as to expect by ſpecial priuiledge, as a perſon particularly fauored, to walk a path by yourſelf, and be exempted from thoſe conditions which are generally required from all? God might do ſo, there is no doubt of it; but it's a madneſs in you to expect it.

You are to enquire what worship God requires from Man; what truths he has reuealed; which is the true ſence of Scripture: I do not doubt, but God might, if he were pleaſed, vſe other means for your inſtruction, without Church, Scripture, Paſtors or Doctors, ſnatching you to the Third Heauen as he did S. Paul 2. Cor. 11. 4. or by ſending an Angel to reſolue your doubts; or by inward illuſtrations and diuine lights: but ſince that in this his preſent Prouidence he has eſtabliſhed a Church, furniſhed as wee mentioned

with Doctors, Paſtors, Apoſtles, and Euangeliſts; and layd an obligation vpon her to teach you, and vpon you to belieue and obey her; will you as a perſon particularly priuiledg'd, expect to haue the knowledge of what you ought to belieue, and to yet the true ſence of Scripture by any other means; than by and from that Oracle, which God has appointed for the inſtruction of all? I pitty ſome deluded ſouls who cry out, *God knowvs if I did knowv the true Religion, and the true ſence of Scripture, I vvould embrace it.* But, friend, do you expect a reuelation from Heauen, or an inward light for to aſcertain you? God has afforded means for to inſtruct vs and commands vs all (he excepts none) to heare and oby her, which is the Church: make vſe of the means which he has appointed, and you will be inſtructed: think not that your ignorance will excuſe your incredulity of what you ought to belieue; when God has giuen you means wherby to be inſtructed, and you will not make vſe of thoſe means; and if you ſay you do not know, which Church is that, which God has appointed for your inſtruction; both by what I haue already diſcourſed, and what shall be ſaid in the enſuing chapters, it will

manifeſtly appeare, that it is the Roman Catholik Church.

But, ſay you, I ſearch the Scripture, as Chriſt commanded, Io. 5. 39. and what I meet not there, I do not belieue; becauſe I am perſuaded it's it that God has left vnto vs for to inſtruct vs; and that it contains expreſly and cleerly, what wee are bound to belieue. But wee haue proued in the two former chapters, that Scripture does not contain all articles which wee are bound to belieue; and that euen the fundamental points of Religion, are not ſufficiently proued by Scripture alone without an infaillible interpreter: for there is not any text hardly of Scripture but may be interpreted in different ſences, and Scripture alone does not aſcertain vs, which is the true ſence: And if an Heretick did aryſe, and ſay, that it is not lawfull to keepe ſunday for a Holy day, but ſaturday; becauſe God commanded this should be kept, and the Apoſtles could not alter it againſt the expreſs command of God, Ex. 20. if he should ſay, that it is lawfull for vs to keepe but one Holy day, and no more in the weeke, and that wee are obliged to work the other ſix dayes according that text, *ſix dayes thou shalt vvork, but the ſeaueth is*

the Sabaoth of they Lord, Ex. 20. can his errour be cleerly proued by Scripture alone? if he should say, that it is not conformable to the instruction of Christ, to giue the Communion to Women, because wee do not read that Christ should haue giuen it to any; by what Scripture will you conuince him of an error? If he should say, that you cannot in conscience defend your right against one who commences a suit in law against you, or that is an vniust vsurper of your goods; he will giue you plain Scripture for it: *To him that will contest with you in Law, and take your Coat from you, giue him also your Cloak*: Mat. 5. 40. and by what text will you conuince him, that he misvnderstands that text? if he should say with the *Luciferians*, that a Priest who would apostatise from his Religion, ought not to be receiued again to the Communion of the Church, though he did repent, grounded vpon the words of Christ, Mat. 5. *if the salt* (that's to say the Doctors and Pastors of the Church) *hath lost its Sauour, vvher vvith shall it be salted? it is therfore good for nothing but to be cast out, and trod vnder foot of men.* This is a damnable error, the doore is still open Mr Sall, if you will but knock with repen-

tance

tance: yet no text of Scripture doth cleerly conuince that errour; finally there was neuer yet any Hereſy, nor neuer will be, but will hit vpon ſome text of Scripture to proue its error: and if it be lawfull for euery man to interpret the Scripture in the ſence that ſeems beſt to him, they will neuer be conuinced by Scripture alone.

Hence it follows, that ſince the texts of Scripture admit different ſences; either of two things muſt happen; or that God has left it arbitrary to Mankind, to beliene that ſence, which each one *bonafide* thinks in his own iudgment to be the beſt; and has not obliged him to ſubmit his iudgment to the ſence giuen by any other; and if ſo, Arrianis, Proteſtants, Catholiks and all are of a good Religion; for each of vs belienes that ſence of Scripture which wee think the trueſt, which is all that God requires. Or if God has obliged vs all, to beliene one ſence of Scripture, though that ſence may not ſeem the beſt to this, or that particular man; and will haue vs ſubmit our iudgments and beliene that ſence, which he obliges vs all to beliene; if ſo, then God muſt haue appointed ſome ſuprem Autority to declare vnto vs, what ſence is that, which he will haue vs all

belieue; to which all dissenting Parties must assent, and submit their iudgment: for it were vnbecoming the goodnes of God to oblige man vnder pain of damnation to belieue one sence, and no other of all the different sences the letter of Scripture admits; and not to afford som assured means and publick Authority (for no priuat authority will suffice) to propose vnto vs, what sence it that. Nor will it be possible to keep vs in Vnity of Faith, without this suprem Authority, for its not possible to haue Vnity of Faith, if wee do not all hold one and the same sence of Scripture: nor it is possible that wee all hold the same sence, if there be not a publick Authority for to propose vnto vs what sence is it, that wee must hold, to whose iudgment wee must be all bound to acquiesce; for if it be lawfull for euery man to reiect that Authority, and hold that sence of Scripture which he iudges the best; it will be lawfull for euery man to liue in a different Religion from that of others, and so there will neuer be any Vnity of Faith and Religion.

Now that the suprem Authority appointed by Christ for to decide our Controuersies, and deliuer vnto vs the true sence

of Scripture, is the Church eſtablisht by Christ, Its proued by the texts of Scripture alleadged in the beginning of this Chap. its proued alſo by the practiſe of all ages; for when in the Apoſtles dayes there aroſe a controuerſy about the Circumciſion of the Gentils ſom affirmed they ought, not only be baptiſed, but alſo circumciſed; others denyed the Neceſſity of Circumciſion; both Parties alleadged Scripture, but neither was appayed: and how was the controuerſy decided and the true ſence of Scripture alleadged by both, propoſed; by the Church conuened in a Council at Ieruſalem. Act. 15. the one Party was condemned for Hereticks if they did not ſubmit, and acquieſce to the Doctrin propoſed by the Church. About the yeare 324. aroſe a diſpute betwix Arrius, (that was a member of the Catholick Church, and others alſo Catholicks, concerning the Diuinity of Christ; each of the diſputants alleadged ſeueral texts of Scripture, and pretended his own, to be the true ſence: who decided this Controuerſy? was it the Scripture alone without a publick authority to propoſe the ſence of it? No, but the Church, gathered in the Nicen Council, to whoſe deciſions all Christians were

bound to acquieſce, and condemned as Hereticks that would not. About the yeare 378. aroſe a diſpute between Macedonius and other Catholicks concerning the Diuinity of the H. G. which he denied; both Parties cited many texts of Scripture, but the diſpute was not ended vntill the Church, gathered in a Council at Conſtantinople, examined the queſtion and texts produced by both Conteſtants, and concluded againſt Macedonius: after which Deciſion it was not lawfull to doubt of the Diuinity of the H. G. To be brief look into all ages that euer any queſtion aroſe concerning Religion, the final deciſion was alluayes deuolued to the Church, who deliuered the true ſence of Scripture quoted by the Diſputants, and eſteemed an Heretick that did not ſubmit. This shews that the world did euer yet belieue, the ſuprem authority of deciding controuerſies, and deliuering the true ſenſe of Scripture was ſtill in the Church.

But the wery Proteſtants themiſelues, who decry the Church, and will haue no other Iugde of Controuerſies but Scripture, do confeſs that betwixt two Parties prouing their differents Aſſertions of Religion out of Scripture, the Church hath the ſuprem

authority of deciding, and deliuering the true ſence of Scripture, to which both Parties are obliged in conſcience to acquieſce: read Doctor Porter in his Treatiſe of *Char. Miſt.* pag. 195. and Chillingworth in his Book of the *Proteſtant Religion a ſafe vvay of ſaluation*, pag. 206. and B. Lawd cited by Doctor Porter they teach, *that the Decrees of General Council bind all Perſons, oblige in conſcience, til euidence of Scripture or a demonſtration maks their error appeare, that they are not to be controlled by priuat ſpirits, nor cannot de renuerſed but by an equal authority of an other General Council* But becauſe Proteſtants eaſily contradict one an other; and others will ſay theſe are but opinions of priuat Doctors, and not the Doctrin of the Proteſtant Church: I will proue that what euer their Doctrin be, their practice proues that they believe the ſupreme authority of deciding Controuerſies betwixt two Parties diſputing out of Scripture, to be only in the Church: the proof.

Arminius a Miniſter of Amſterdam and Profeſſor of Diuinity at Leyden, broached new Doctrin, touching points of *Predeſtination*, *Grace* and *Liberty*; quite contrary to the Doctrin of Caluin, receiued in the

Churchs of *Holland*. By his wit and credit, he got many Profelyts, that in a short tyme, his Doctrin made great progres throughout all the *States*. *Gomarus*, nothing inferior to him in wit and reputation; an ancient Professor of Diuinity at Groeningue opposed this nouelty, and with all the ancient *Ministers* stood for the Doctrin of *Caluin*. Printed Pamphlets were publisht, Texts of Scripture quoted, but neither did yield to the other; each drew Abettors to their opinions, and the Prouinces were deuided into two factions of *Armenians*, and *Gomarists*. The Churchs of Hollands petitioned to the *States* General for a National Synod to determin the Controuersy, but *Armenius* strengthned with the protection of *Barneuelt* Aduocat General of the *States*, obtained that in lieu of a Synod, the matter should be discussed in a conference of Diuins: the States deputed som persons of quality for to heare the Disputants; *Arminius* presented himself with four Diuines, and *Gomarus* with as many: *Arminius* his fiue articles were scan'd, texts of Scripture searched for, and carefully examined, reasons proposed by both Parties with all ardor, nothing omitted that wit or industruy could giue, and after a re-

dious and eager disputc, the question remained vndecided; the Parties receded, each proclaming the victory.

Arminius dyed soon after, but his schollers took vp the cudgle, and gain'd so much ground vpon the *Gomarists*, that all the three Prouinces of *Holland*, *Vtrecht*, and *Ouerissel* embraced their fiue Articles; and pretended a petition to the States Generall for a toleration in the profession of that Doctrin, which they offered to defend with the pure word of God: adding, it did not appertain to a National Synod but to the Diuins of each particular Prouince to take cognisance of the affairs of Religion in that Prouince; and therefore they protested against any National Synod. The *Gomarists* on the other syde cryed out for a Synod: the controuersy did not only trouble the peace of the Prouinces, but made a great *Ecco* in the neigh bouring Reformed Churchs. The King of *England* by his Embassador, Sr *Dudley Carleton*, represented to the States that the only means for to allay those disputes was a National Synod, to whom it belonged to iudge which of the Doctrins controuerted was the most conformable to the word of God, and if both could be toletated in the Church; and

therefore demanded a Synod. *Zeland* and the other Prouinces demanded the same, as also the Protestant Princes of *Germany*; the Commonwealth of *Geneua*, and generally all the Reformed Churchs. All this passage is faithfully extracted, *ex Act. Synodi Dordrectani, Typis Isaaci Ioannis Canicy* printed at Dordrecht an. Dom. 1620.

Heervpon the States General issued their circular letters to all the Prouinces requiring, that each should send six of their best Diuines to Dordrecht, were the Synod was open'd the 13. December an 1618. The King of *England*, the Electors of *Palatin*, *Branderbourg*, and *Lantgraue of Hesse*, *the Valons*, *the Cantons of Surich*, *Berne*, *Basle*, and *Schaffouse*, the Commonwealths of *Geneua*, *Breme*, and *Embidem* sent their Diuins of most credit and learning to this Synod, so that wee may call it more than a National Synod, and a Representatiue of all the Reformed Churchs. And though the Ministers of France were not permitted to go thither, they sent their iudgment of the question debated, in writing. The *Arminians* protested against the Synod, as being a Partie concerned; and consequently not a competent Iudge, being composed of Persons confessedly of the doctrin of the

Gomarists. (was it not thus that the Reformers protested against the Council of Trent.) The deputies of te extern Churches deliuered in writing their opinions of this protestation: Those of *England*; that it was against the practice of the primitiue Church; of the Councils of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Chalcedo*, and *Ephese*, whose members were confessedly of the Catholick Church, opposed by *Arius*, *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, and *Eutyches*; that not withstanding they were competent iudges, against whom no protestation was admitted, but all Parties were obliged to submit. The Diuins of *Palatin*; that to determin a controuersy in Religion, the Parties must not go to the Turks or Pagans, or to indifferent Persons, that profess no Religion; but must be said by the Pastors and Prelats of that Church, wherof they are members, and wherin the question is debated. The Diuins of *Geneua*, that both Parties were by the sentence of Christ bound to submit to the Synod, or to be esteemed Heathens and Publicans. All the rest of the Diuins concluded the same; whervpon the Synod condemned that protestation, and declared, it self to be the lawfull and soueraign Iudge in that cause; *Vel abycere debent om-*

nem proteſtationem aduerſus Synodum, & ſubjicere ſua dogmata illius judicio, vel certe ſi manent in proteſtatione immoti, eo ipſo ſe declarant vnioni Eccleſiarum reformatarum renunciare: Or they muſt ſet by all Proteſtations againſt the Synod, and ſubmit their doctrin to its iudgment, or if they perſiſt in their proteſtation, therby they declare themſelues to renounce the communion of reformed Churches. Is not this to declare them Schiſmaticks that will not ſubmit to the Church? The *Armenians* were then ſummoned to waue the Proteſtation and giue in writing their fiue articles, which they did; they were examined by the Synod, and condemned as erroneous and contrary to the word of God; and all thoſe that would ſuſtain them incapacitated for to beare any charge, or exerciſe any Eccleſiaſticall function, Seſſ. 138.

The Armeniens did not ſubmit to this iudgment alleadging the Synod (as all others) was fallible, and did err in this point, and therefore could not be obliged in conſcience to ſubmit; and perhaps ſome Proteſtants will ſyde with them, ſaying that a Councill can not oblige mens conſciences, and that their Decrees can reach no further, than to what concerns the

Politick gouernment of the flock: but this Synod, which indeed was more than a National one, of the Reformed Churchs, and assisted by the deputyes of the Church of England, declares an obligation in *conscience* of acquiescing to its decisions, not only by the words now alleaged, but by the Sess. 42. *Si conscientiæ suæ (quam debent) rationem habent, ad obtemperandum supremarum Potestatum mandatis, hujusque Synodi ordini & iudicio acquiescendum tenentur. If they haue any regard for their Conscience,* (behold their Decrees reach to the Consciences) *they are bound to obey the commands of the heigher Powers, and acquiesce to the iudgment of this Synod.* And immediatly after this Synod, when the *Arminiens* insisted in their reason for not submitting, *because the Synod was fallible*, the States consulted their National Synod then assembled at *Delpht*, what ought to be don, This answered, that notwithstanding the Synod was fallible, they were obliged in conscience to believe the sence of Scripture proposed by it: and giues for reason; that wheras many pious and learned Doctors from all Churchs did meet together in the feare of the Lord, to declare by the word of God, what ought to be believed, *omnium*

credendum est, it must be vndoubtedly beliued, that Christ according his promiss, was present to that meeting, and gouern'd it, by the Holy Ghost Iudic. Syn. Desph. Sess. 26. Syn. Dord. And if the Decrees of Councils reach not to oblige Consciences, then Arrius must not be iudged an Heretick though condemned by the Council of Nice, nor can Mr Sall beliue S. Athanasius his Creed with the heauenly gift of Faith wherwhith he beliues the Scripture, as he acknowledges, pag. 18.

Now whatsoeuer any particular Doctor or Doctors of the Church of England say; what Pagan, would enquire into the Mysteries of Christian Religion with a desire of being instructed, would reade this Synod of *Dordrecht*, and *Delpht*, and also the Councils of Nice and all other General Councils of the Catholick Church, and would not vnderstanding, that it is the Doctrin and practice of both Church the Reformed and Catholick, that the Councils haue the suprem Authority of deciding Controuersies, and deliuering the true sence of Scripture; that none can protest against the authority of Councils legally assembled; and that both Parties contesting about any point of Religion, is to be

ſaid by the Church, wherof they are Members, and whoeuer will not ſubmit renounces the vnion of the Church, and becoms ſchiſmatick.

Hence it follows M. Sall, that wheras there was no Chriſtian Church viſible, when your firſt Reformers oppoſed the Catholick Tenets, but the Roman Catholick Church; They were obliged to be iudged by her, and ſubmit their doctrin to her iudgment, they being Members of that Church; that in declining her Authority in the Council of Trent, and proteſting againſt her, as being a Partie, and fallible; they became Schiſmaticks. And if the Reformation in its ofspring was ſchiſmatical, doubtleſs in their continuation it muſt be ſo, for tyme giues no preſcription to an errour, nor haue you more right to continue in that ſeparation from vs, than your firſt Reformers had to begin it. And as the Arrians are ſtill Hereticks, though ſeparated from vs theſe 1300 years, and ſtill obliged to return, ſo are you.

Now let vs heare M. Sall what means did he vſe to vnderſtand the true ſence of Scripture; to ſatisfy his doubts in Religion, and to know what he ought to believe; and wee will find he did not vſe the means

which Christ appointed for our instruction; pag. 17. you tell vs, Mr Sall, that you discouered the Roman Church to be *guilty of idolatry, couelty and impiety*; your wit, say you, demanded you a reason for what you beliewed; and if it demanded and euidently co cluding reason, it ourlasht, wheras the Mysteries of Religion are of things not appearing, as S. Paul saies, surpassing reason: you frequently, perused the Scripture the Councils Fathers, and Histories, and all made you *doubt* of the Truth of our Tenets; the consequence therefore is vndenyable that Scripture alone, is so far from being cleer, and easy in points of Religion, that it alone nor with the assistance of Historyes, Councils and Fathers, is not sufficient, euen to so great a wit as you pretend to be, in no wayes *obstinat vvillfully*, but desirous to know and embrace the truth, is not I say sufficient to assure you what is an errour or not; consequently somwhat else is wanting to know what wee ought to beliewe.

Pag. 37. you tell vs that *you vvent to the Church of Englaud, vvhose Eminent Persons by vvord and vvritting did assert*, (do not you see that besides the Scripture, wee

want a liuing Church to inform vs what wee out to belieue ?) *that the ſumme of our Faith, is the vvord of God contained in Canonical Scripture, and the plain vndubitable conſequences out of it.* But Mr Sall, you might haue belyed them all by your own experience, who read Scriptuse, aſſiſted with your eminent with (forſooth) and knowleg in ſciences, aſſiſted by the Fathers Hiſtoryes and Councils, and yet, as you tell vs, all *made you doubt* (pag. 18.) but could not aſſure you of the truth or vntruth of our errours : conſequently ſomthing elſe is requiſit for to know aſſuredly what is Truth, and what not : But Mr Sall, before that the Church of England, by her Eminent Perſons, did tell you the Scripture alone and its vndubitable conſequences is the intyre ſumme of Faith, did you know that to be be true ? did you vnderſtand it to be true by the Scripture when you frequently read it, and by Councils and Fathers ? if you did. to what purpoſe do you ſpeake vnto vs of the Church of England? what need had you to go to her? You ought to haue ſought and found the reſolution of your doubts in the Scripture alone and its vndubitable conſequences : if you did not, then you belieue the Scripture

and its indubitable consequences to be the summe of our Faith vpon the testimony of the Church of England and her Eminent Persons, which being fallible as you and she confess, all your Faith is built on a fallible bottom.

Moreouer Mr Sall, the Church of England informed, that the Scripture alone, and its indubitable consequences are the whole summe of diuine Faith: but did the Church of England tell you, who is he, that must draw those indubitable consequences? Must those consequences be drawen by a publick Authority established by Christ, or is it sufficient that the consequences seem vndubitable to you or me, or any priuat person? If the second, then all sectaries in the world haue a true rule of Faith, which is their own reason that dictats what they believe, to be an vndenyable consequence of Scripture; and none can blame them for they regulat their Faith by the rule that Christ has appointed, if the first, then the Church of England, should haue informed you, what suprem Authority is that, which must draw those consequences, and aproue or reproue those which to priuat persons seem to be vndeniably deduced out of Scripture: But this

this which your instructors omitted, has been shewen vnto you in this Chapter, not only by Scripture and reason, but by the practise of your Reformed Churchs represented in the Synod of Dordrecht; that when two Contestants draw contradictory consequences out of Scripture, each one pretending his own to be vndubitably deduc'd out of the Text, the Church wherof the Parties are Members, has the suprem Authority to resolue which is the true consequence; that the Parties are bound in conscience to submit to her iudgment; and to be held for Schismatiks if they do not: and wheras your first Reformers drew consequences which seemed to them to follow vndubitably from Scripture, and their Aduersaryes iudged the contrary to be vndubitable true; your Reformers were bound to submit to the Catholik Church wherof theyr were Members, and learne of her which were the true consequences, and were Schismatick for not doing so; and as their errour descended to you and your liuing Brethren; the obligation also of being instructed by the Catholik Church, and acquiescing to her iudgment descends vnto you. And thus Mr Sall you miserably mistooke the means

which Christ appointed for to instruct vs in Religion.

V. CHAPTER.

THE CHVRCH ESTABLISHED FOR our instruction, is infallible.

THough I reserue a chapter a part for Mr Salls arguments against this Tenet, yet I must heere touch two of them, which shew that he is either ignorant, or malicious in mistaking our doctrin, by the answer to which I will declare, what wee believe in this particular. He impugns our doctrin from the pag. 29. to 35. and from the pag. 39. to 44. pag. 39. he argues that Infallibility is an *Attribut* proper to Gods *essence*, which can no more be communicated to any Creature, than the *Deyty* itself; its a Blasphemy, saies he, to attribute to any creature, that which is proper to God alone; consequenty the Church of Rome is guilty of Blasphemy in teaching the Pope or Council is infallible. I cannot believe but that you are sufficienty sensible of the weakness of this argument, which from the very beginning of your

pretended Reformation is ſo common, that any Collier will anſwer it; eſpecially that it, and all the arguments you bring in your whole diſcourſe are exactly ſet down in Bellarmin, (whence you haue borrowed them) and moſt euidently anſwered; and if you had any ingenuity you ought not to trouble your Auditory with ſuch thrid bare tryfles, but tell them alſo, what wee anſwer; and retort it if you could. Can you that pretends to the credit of a Profeſſor of Diuinity, ignore, that a man, who is by his own Nature *Mortal*, might by Gods Protection, (who promiſes him, he shall neuer dye) be *immortal*? and why will you deny but that Man, who by Nature is ſubiect to errour, may by Gods ſpecial protection, (promiſing him that he shall neuer err) be kept from falling into any errour or miſtake? This is what wee belieue, that the Church, which is by Nature (as being a congregation of Men) fallible, may be miſtaken, and though ignorance or malice teach an vntruth, but that God has promiſed to aſſiſt her continually with his ſpirit, for to leade her into all Truth; and neuer to permit her to teach or belieue any errour: by virtue of wich promiſs (iudge you if ſuch a promiſs

be impoſſible) wee ſay the Church cannot err in her doctrin, which is to be infallible.

Dare you deny, but that the Prophets, the Apoſtles, and Euangeliſts were infallible, in what they taught and writ? dare you deny but that the Church of God is infallible in fundamental points of Religion? and are you therefore guilty of Blaſphemy, or do you intrench on Gods prerogatiues, or giue his Attributs to creatures? God is infallible by Nature; by his own proper perfection, this is his Attribut; and this cannot be giuen to any creature: to be infallible by the protection of an other, who defends him from falling into any errour, is not Attribut of God, it were a Blaſphemy to ſay that he is infallible in that manner; but the Prophets, Apoſtles, Euangeliſts, and the Church are thus infallible, by Gods ſpecial protection and the conduct of his ſpirit.

An other argument againſt our Tenet. pag. 30. is the diſagreement of our Authors, in placing this infallibity: ſome will haue it to be in the Pope alone; others in him and a Council of Cardinals; others in the Pope and General Council alone. This diſſention is to Mr Sall a concluding argument that there is no ſuch thing as Church

infallibity: and thus he furnishes the *Deists* with a concluding argument, that there is no such thing as true Religion in the world; for, will the *Deists* say with him; the Authors that pretend to true Religion, do not agree where it is; some say its in the Iewish Church; others that it is in the Protestants, others in the Catholik Church; others in other Congregations; and will conclude in M. Salls Dialect; that there is no such thing as true Religion extant, because the Pretenders to it, do not agree where to find it. But the poore Man, ignorantly or maliciously mistakes our doctrin: all Catholiks do agree in the infallibility of the Pope and General Council ioyntly, this is the infallibility wee believe as an article of Faith.

Its true, that the Catholik Authors do dispute if the Pope alone is infallible; some say he is, and will haue it to be an article of Faith that he is; others say that he is not, but with a Council of Cardinals and Diuines; others say, that neither this is an article of Faith: some say that a General Council legally assembled is infallible in their Decrees, though not confirmed by the Pope; others say not, if they be not confirmed by him. But all these are but school questions; the Church heares them,

and permits them to dispute: and whateuer Bellarmin or any other saies, wee are not obliged to believe it to be an article of faith whylst it is opposed by other Catholick Doctors and the Church does not determin the Controuersy: but what you are to observe is; that those Doctors who defend the infalliblity of the Pope alone; and those that deny it; those that affirm the infallibility of the Council alone, and those that contradict it, they agree vnanimously in the infallibity of the Pope and Council together; because that with out any controuersy the Pope and Council ioyintly, represents the vniuersal Church; and the vniuersal Church is infallible: this is the article of Faith wee believe. And if you tell vs, a Pope, or a General Council has err'd; you will tell vs nothing to the purpose, if you do not shew that a Pope and Council together has err'd: for that's the Church, hauing by the answer of these two arguments, declared what infallibility the Church clayms, and where wee believe this infallibility to be, let vs nowproue our Tenet.

Firſt, its a comfort to an vnacquainted Traueller to be guided by one whom he firmly believes to be acquainted with the way: though really your guide were not

acquainted with the way, if you certainly belieue he is, and that he cannot ſtray; though you do not know the way your-ſelf, you will follw him with ſatisfac-tion, and without feare of being byaſs'd: but if you do not know the way, and you belieue your guide is not ſo well acquain-ted, but that he may ſtray; you will ſtill trauell with feare of being byaſs'd. This is the different condition of a Catholik and a Proteſtant: the Catholick trauelling in the way to ſaluation, (which is Religion) is guided by a Church, which he, without the leaſt doubt, belieues cannot be miſtaken; whether she can or not, ſince he is abſo-lutly perſwaded she cannot, he trauells with ſatisfaction and without feare: the Proteſtant in this way, is guided by a Church, which he belieues, is not ſo well aſſured of the way, but that she may err; ought he not therefore to walk diſatis-fyed, and with continual feare of being miſſead?

You anſwer that the Proteſtant is not lead by the Church, but by the Scripture; which is an infallible guide. Its very ſure, the Scriptute is infallible, vnderſtood in the true ſence, but you can haue no aſſu-rance that you haue the true ſence of Scri-

pture ; consequently you can haue no assurance, that you haue an infallible guide ; this proposition is certain : *The Scripture ill interpreted, does mislead* : this proposition is also certain, *you, and your Church may err, in the interpretation of Scripture comparing one text with an other.* Since therefore your guide in the road of Faith, is the Scripture interpreted by you, and your Church, comparing on text with an other. You are guided by a guide, that may err and mislead you ; and as you haue no well grounded assurance, that you and your Church do not err in the interpretation of Scripture, cõparing one text with an other ; you can haue no assurance but that you are mislead. But the Catholik believing his Church to be infallible in the interpretation of Scripture, does rest his mind in the full assurance of the truth he professeth.

And ought not you to embrace that doctrin, which giues you that satisfaction, and rest of mind ; rather than the Protestant doctrin of fallibility, which leaues you doubtfull, if what you believe be true or not ? Particularly when in believing it, you hazard nothing : not your saluation ; for all learned Protestants (which wee will proue against Mr Sall) do grant saluation

in the expreſs beliefe of articles of Popery; you reply, its no ſolid comfort, that the Catholik amuſes himſelf with, in belieuing his Church that guides him to be infallible, if really she be not ſo: for if it proues in effect to be otherwiſe, he will come short of his imaginary comfort, and will find that he and his Church is miſtaken. I anſwer, if wee conſider the teſtimonies of Scripture, the ſtrength of reaſon, the conſent of ages, the multitude of Vniuerſityes Fathers and Doctors that defend this doctrin of infallibility; it is as lykely to be true as your doctrin of fallibility; its as lykely that you are miſtaken in belieuing fallibility, as I am in belieuing infallibility: you run therefore as great a hazard of being miſtaken as I do: on the other ſyde, you cannot haue that ſatisfaction without feare of being mislead; that reſt of mind, in the aſſurance of the truth (for you may err) by belieuing fallibility, as I haue by belieuing infallibility: my condition then is ſtill better than yours, and my doctrin to be prefered before yours.

Your Church, as you confeſs may err in points of Religion, whence it manifeſtly follows that it is not the true ſence of Scripture, that leads you in the road to

Religion; for the true ſence of Scripture is abſolutly infallible: I ask you therefore, on what do you ground your Faith? You tell me, that vpon the Scripture as interpreted by your Church, and comparing one text with an other; but it may happen that your Church may err in the interpretation; that you confeſs, for you ſay the true Church may err, now I argue thus: whoeuer may err, relying vpon a Principle; can neuer be ſure that he does not err, whylſt he relyes only on that Principle: this propoſition is vndeniable; for if he can err relying on that Principle; its becauſe the Principle is fallible, and if the Principle be fallible, it alone without the help of ſome other, can neuer giue any aſſurance that you do not err: for example you believe the King is in London becauſe an honeſt Man tells you ſo; that is a fallible ground, which you rely on, and you may err by relying on that ground, and as long as you rely only on that mans teſtimony, and haue no other; you will neuer be aſſured of the Kings being at London. You believe the Church fallibility: and on what ground do you rely? on Scripture as interpreted by the Church: you may err relying on this Principle as

you confeſs; therefore as long as you rely on this Principle only, and haue no other, you can neuer be aſſured that you do not err: the Church of England has no other, nor will admit no other Principle to ground their Faith vpon, but the Scripture interpreted by her, and comparing one text with an other therefore she can neuer be aſſured of the doctrin she believes; conſequently cannot be aſſured of the fallibility of the true Church.

What will you ſay in this caſe: there is a Man accuſed of Murther before your tribunal, he does not only deny the fact, but many circumſtances fauours his innocency, and the very Perſon that accuſes him ſaies, he is not ſure, he is the Murtherer: ſurely you would not condemn this Man to death; it being againſt all the maxims of iuſtice to punish a man that is not conuicted criminal. This is the very matter in hand: the true Church is accuſed of fallibility and falshood in her doctrin; the circumſtances of hauing florished for ſo many ages, in the credit of an infallible Oracle, fauors her innocency, and her Accuſer, which is the Church of England, does confeſs that she may err in her accuſation, and conſequently muſt confeſs, as

wee proued, that she cannot be sure, she does not err; for she grounds her accusation on the Scripture interpreted by her, in which she may err; and whylst she has no other Principle but that, she can neuer be certain she does not err: will not you then acquit the Church, of whose crime her accuser is not sure, as you would that Man accused of Murther?

Add this discourse to the former: it is a Principle in all well gouerned Commonwealhs, that a preacable Possessor is not to be disturbd from his possession, vntill that by vnquestionable proofs he be conuicted an vniust vsurper or detainer; no coniectures, nor probable reasons will put him out of possession: he will still with a safe conscience maintain it; and the law will continue him in it, vntill that by euident proofs he be conuicted. The true Church was in all ages in peacable possession of this prerogatiue of infallibility, neuer denyed to her, but by some few condemned Heretiks: what euident vnquestionable proofs can you bring to conuince her an vniust vsurper or detainer of it? Reason affords you none, for to say that infallibility is an Attribut proper to God, is impertinent; wheras she clayms no other infal-

libility, but such as you grant to the Prophets, Apostles and Euangelists: but, say you, in a General Council, which is a multitude of Men, where a point of Religion is to be resolued by the maior part of Votes: and where passion, and interest somtymes may sway, it may happen, that an errour may haue more Abettors, and truth be out voted: This is to say that God has no Prouidence ouer his Church: since he has promised the conduct of his infallible spirit to her, for to lead her into all truth, and keep her vnspotted from all errours; let each particular of that multitude be euer so corrupt in himself: God, who can as easily gouern the harts of many, as of one; will not permit them to determin an errour, nor truth to be out voted. Was not the Council of the Apostles and Ancients at Ierusalem a multitude? Were not the first four General Concils multitudes, which the Protestants confess to haue been infallible, and guided by Gods spirit, which was as necessary to the Councils of succeeding ages, the emergent Controuersyes being no fewer in number, nor less in weight.

Neither does Scripture afford you any match, if you can these texts: *I am with*

you all the dayes, untill the consummation of the vvorld Math. 28. 20. and if the Church did teach an vntruth, would Christ be with her then? *He vvill give you an other Paraclet the Spirit of Truth, that vvill abyde vvith you for euer; vvho vvill leade you into all truth.* Io. 14. 16. *vvhen the Paraclet vvill come, vvhom I vvill send from my Father, the Spirit of truth, he vvill giue testimony of me, and you vvill giue testimony:* Io. 15. 26. the Paraclet and the Chruch, are ioynt Witnesses of the truth.

Nor does experience fauor you: all that you can shew is that some Pope did err, or that some Council did err; but thats not to the purpose, if you do not shew (which you will neuer do) thal a Pope and Council together has erred. wheras therefore neither scripture, Reason, nor experience doth afford you any vnquestionable evident proofs, that the Chruch is an vnuist vsurper or detainer of that prerogatiue of infaillibility, which she has en ioyed in all ages, why will you pretend to disturb her peacable possession?

Let vs heare what the scripture suyes: Lu. 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me:* Christ spoke to his Apostles and Disciples on whom he layd the charge of teaching

and preaching, and who were the Church repreſentatiue: whateuer therefore wee heare from the Chruch repreſentatiue, wee heare it from Chriſt; whateuer the Church ſpeaks, Chriſt ſpeaks, otherwyſe wee should not heare Chriſt ſpeak, when wee heare the Church ſpeake: the Church therefore, is the Mouth by which Chriſt ſpeaks: and as we cannot heare an vntruth from him, as he cannot ſpeak any, ſo she cannot ſpeake, nor be heard to ſpeake an vntruth: this is declared by S. Paul 1. Theſ. 2. 13. *vvhen you receiued from vs the vvord of the hearing of God, you receiued it, not as the vvord of Man, but as indeed it is, the vvord of God.* And therefore ſayes he 1. Theſ. 4. 8. *he that deſpeiſeth theſe things, deſpeiſeth not man, but God.* Could a man ſpeake more pertinently to ſignify that the doctrin of the Church is the doctrin of God; that when wee heare her, we heare him; and that her words are infaillible, wheras they are the words of God?

Obſerve that the Council of Apoſtles and Ancients at Ieruſalem. Act. 15. 28. deciding the Controuerſy concerning Circumciſion, delivers their ſentence thus; *It ſeemeth good to the Holy Ghoſt and to vs.* Signifying that the reſolution proceeded

ioyntly from both; from the *Holy Ghoſt*, by his inward inſpiration and direction; from the Council, by its outward declaration: can wee doubt therefore, but that the reſolution of Controuerſyes by that Council was infallibly true; and not only of that, but alſo of all ſucceeding Councils; wheras the Apoſtles pronounced their ſentence in thoſe words, grounded on the words of Chriſt; *He that heareth you heareth me*, grounded on the words of Chriſt Io. 15. 26. *vvhen the Paraclet vvil come, he shall giue teſtimony of me and you shall give teſtimony*; in which words Chriſt did ſpeak to his Church, which was the witneſs, which ioyntly with the Holy Ghoſt, was to giue teſtimony of him; and grounded on the Promiſs of his Paraclet, which was made by Chriſt, not only to the Apoſtles, but to his Church for euer, *vntill the conſummation of the vvorld*.

This is yet more cleerly proved by the following diſcourſe: Chriſt commands vs to heare the Church; that he that deſpeiſeth her deſpeiſeth him Lu. 10. 16. to obſerue and do what thoſe that ſit on Moyſes his chayre, bids vs do Mat. 23. 2. commands them to be eſteemed as *Heathens* and *Publicans*, that will not obey her.

S. Paul

S. Paul commands vs (Heb. 13. 17.) not to be carried away with various and ſtrang Doctrins, but obey the Church, wherin ſayes he, Eph. 4. God has placed Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Doctors and Paſtors to teach vs: out of theſe and the lyke texts, (which are frequent in ſcripture,) largue thus. He that does what Chriſt bids him do, and belieues what he bids him belieue; cannot do amiſs, nor belieue an errour: but Chriſt bids vs belieue and do, what the Church commands vs to belieue and do, as appeares by theſe texts; therefore he that does what the Church commands him to do, and belieues what she commands vs to belieue; cannot do amiſs nor belieue an errour: conſequently what tenet the Church teachs is no errour.

To conclude. S. Io. 1. epiſ. 4. 6. hauing warned vs to try our Spirits, if from God or Satan; he gives vs a rule wherby to try them; *he that knowveth God heareth vs, he that knowveth not God, heareth vs not. In this we know the Spirit of truth, and the Spirit of errour.* This is the way preſcribed by S. Iohn to aſcertain vs of the nature of our Spirits: if our Spirit be conformable to the Spirit of the Church,

its a Spirit of Truth; if it does not conform itself to the Spirit of the Church; its a Spirit of errour: but if the Spirit of the Church de fallible, it can give me no assurance of my Spirit, whether it be of truth or of errour: for what assurance can you haue, that the Cloath which you measure is of a yard in length; if you be not assured, that the yard wherwith you measure, it is an exact yard? neither therefore can you be assured that your Spirit is of truth by trying it with the Spirit of the Church; if you be not assured that the Spirit of the Church is of Truth.

But because our Aduersaries, will still reply that all this is to be vnderstood of the Apostles, who were infallible whylst they liued, and are now infallible in their written word: Ihaue already shewen that the written word is not sufficient to ascertain vs of the truth or vntruth of our Spirits, and will now proue in this.

VI. CHAPT.

THAT NOT ONLY THE APOSTLES and Church in their dayes, but that the Church in all ſucceeding ages is infallible.

THe Church of England confeſſes that the Apoſtles and Church in their tyme, nay and for ſome ages after (if you ask how many they do not agree) was infaillible; this is not conſequent to their Principles that ſay only God is infallible; but howeuer, its their Doctrin, as appears in Mr Salls diſcourſe pag. 18 profeſſing to belieue, the Holy ſcripture the Apoſtles *Creed*, and S. Athanaſius his *Creed* (parallelling this wth the other two) *vvith the heauenly gift of faith*; and if the Council of Nice, which deliuered vnto vs the doctrin contained in Athanaſius his Creed, had not been directed by the Holy Ghoſt, as the Writers of the ſcripture were; it were à Blaſphemy to belieue that Creed, and the doctrin of the Council with the ſame Faith, with which wee belieue the ſcripture. Now the Proteſtants all agree in

this; that now, nor in theſe many ages, the Church is not infallible; for which aſſertion, you muſt expect no ſcripture from them, nor no reaſon, but their bare word.

But let vs ſee what reaſon they pretend: God, ſay they, having giuen vs an infallible written word, ſufficient to inſtruct vs, Church infallibility was for the future needleſs; what ſchool boy but ſees the weakneſs of this reaſon? firſt, after the ſcripture was written, the Church continued infallible for ſome ages, Mr. Sall muſt confeſs by what Ihaue now ſaid; as generally all Proteſtants ſay; and as all, muſt ſay, otherwyſe *Arrius*, and other Hereſiarks, might have queſtioned the truth of their doctrin if they had been fallible; and could not be obliged in conſcience to acquieſce to their iugdment, nor ought not tobe held for Hereticks nor excommunicated for not ſubmitting to them, if they were fallible; as yon do not eſteem yourſelf an Heretick for not ſubmitting to theCatolickChurch on te ſame account. S. Gregory l. 1. c. 24. ſayes of the firſt four Councils *I do embrace and reuerence the four General Councils, as the four Books of the Ghoſpell*; which had been rashly and

impiously said, if they had not been infallible. Secondly if Church infallibility was needbeſs becauſe the ſcripture, which is infallible, was written; then it was alſo needleſs that the Church should be infallible in fundamental points of Religion; and yet Proteſtants do conſtantly auer, that the Church is ſtill infallible in fundamental points, thoughthe ſcripture be infallible alſo in them. Thirdly, the Apoſtles remayned ſtill infallible after the Scripture was written; and why not the Church? fourthly, if infallibility is needleſs, becauſe the Scripture is infallible, wee may ſay alſo that S Iohn is not infallible in is Ghos pell, at leaſt, as to thoſe points which were al ready mentioned in Mathew, Mark, and Luke; or that theſe three, loſt their infallibility by the writing of S. Iohns Ghos pell; becauſe one infallible Ghos pell is ſufficient, at leaſt as to the points it contains.

needleſs

Theſe inſtances shew that reaſon to be very frinolous: and if it proued any thing, at moſt it can proue that the Church infallibility is not *neceſſary* for our *inſtruction*; but it might be neceſſary for other ends of Gods prouidence; who might haue left ſtill that gift of infallibility to his Church,

for a mark of his loue to her. wee find he did promiſe the conduct of his infallible Spirit to his Church ; wee de not find he should haue limited this grace to any tyme ; nay to the contrary, wee find that he ſayd, it should be *for euer, all dayes, to the conſummation of the vvorld*, why should wee therfore limit that fauor vnto à tyme ; to conclude wee haue proued in the 2 and 3 chap. that Scripture is not ſufficient to inſtruct vs, and conſequently an infallible Church is ſtill neceſſary.

An other reaſon no leſs ſilly, to proue that the Church after few ages became fallible : for the Popes. Prelats, and People became very vicious ; and from the debauchery of manners, they came, by Gods iuſt iugdment, to fall into errours in doctrin: which Mr Sall pretends to proue by Scripture pag. 32. *the promiſe made by Chriſt of the Paraclet, for to lead the Church into all truth, vvas a conditional promiſe as appears by Chriſt his vvord* Io. 14. 16. *if you loue me, keep my commandmens, and I vvill ask my father, and he vvill giue you an other Paraclet, that he may abyde vvith you for euer ; euen the Spirit of Truth, vvhom the vvorld cannot receiue.* The Paraclet is promiſed on condition they Keepe the com-

mandments; and by the later words, *vvhom the vvorld cannot receiue*; the Paraclet is flatly denied to all thoſe, the Scripture ſtyles by the name of *vvorld*; that is to ſay, the wicked and wordly men. Hence (ſayes Mr Sall wee can be no more ſure, that the Pope and his Councill are infallible; than wee are that he liues in Gods loue, and obſeruance of his commandments: and wheras it is manifeſt by our own Hiſtoryes, that the Pope, Paſtors and flock haue fallen into many crimes, it followes they haue forfeited the conduct of Gods infaillible Spirit.

If from the lewdneſs of manners, wee might conclude the Churchs corruption in doctrin, what Ghoſpell could the world expect from Luther, and the other pretended Reformers, for whoſe wickdneſs there are as good Records as for the debauchery of Popes and Prelats: the ſinns of Prelats did deface the Ghoſpell, and did the Apoſtaſy of Luther and the Sodomy of Caluin reſtore it to its ſplendor? Chriſt did foreſee that they, who ſhould ſit on the chayre of Moyſes, would be wicked in their lyues; and yet commanded vs, to obey, and belieue their doctrin. The conduct of Gods Spirit promiſed to them, for

to leade them into all Truth, was not a perſonal gift giuen to them for their own ſakes, but for the flock; for to keepe them in vnity of Faith: and therefore though God does permit them to fall into wickedneſs of lyfe, his Prouidence will not permit them to fall into errors of doctrin; that the flock, which it obliged to obey them, may not be mislead. To proue that the Promiſs was only *conditional*, you eorrupt the text: for as well your Bible, as ours, ſayes thus: *if you loue me, keepe my Commandments*; and there puts a *punctum*. Then ads a diſtinct verſe or ſection; *And I vvill ask my Father, and he vvill giue you an other Paraclet &c.* which makes an abſolut ſenee, independent of the former. That this is the true interpretation of that text; it appears, for in ſeueral other texts, That aſſiſtance of as Mat. 28 20. *behold I am vvith you all dayes, euen to the conſummation of the vvorld.* Mat. 16. *the Gates of hell shall not preuayle againſt her.* Io. 16 13. *vvhen the Paraclet shall come the Spirit of Truth, he shall teach you-all truth.* And is it not ſtrang Mr Sall should auerr, the Paraclet was promiſed vpon condition of Gods loue, and obſeruance of his Commandments; wheras the Church remayns ſtill infallible in-

fundamental points; notwithstanding that it has fayled in that condition, as Mr Sall and all Protestants do deknowledge. But what he will neuer answer is, that if that Promis was conditional, it followes wee cannot be sure the Ghospell is infallible, if wee be not sure that the Euangelists, when they wrote it, haue been in theloue of God, and obseruance of his Commandments; for if they were not, they had not the Paraclet sayes Mr Sall; but no text of Scripture tells vs, that the Euangelists were in the state of Grace when they writ the Ghospell; nor nothing else giues vs assurance of it. Therefore wee are not assured the Ghospell written by the Euangelists is infallible: nay which is worse, in the common doctrin of Protestants, wee are assured it is not infaillible; for the common doctrin in their Church is, that it is impossible to keepe Gods commandments; the Euangelists therefore, when they writ did not keep Gods Commandments; consequenly they could not haue the Paraclet to lead them into truth; consequenly the Ghospell is not infallible, and so Mr Sall ouerthrows all-Christian Religion.

Let vs consider what inducements had the primitiue Christians to belieue the A-

poſtles infallible: was it not the teſtimony of the Apoſtles, confirming their doctrin with many Miracles? look into the Hiſtoryes of all ſucceding ages, and you will find, that the Church, which affirmed herſelf to be infallible, did confirm her doctrin with many and great Miracle, as wee will euidence in the enſuing Chap. And on what do you ground your beliefe, when you ſay the Apoſtles were infallible? You ſay, that vpon the Scripture: but I defy you to shew any text of Scripture which declares the infallibility of the Apoſtles, that relates not to the Church in ſucceeding ages, as well as to them; either therefore they proue the Church to be infallible in ſucceeding ages, or they do not proue the Apoſtles to be infallible.

For example wee proue the infallibility of the Apoſtles by the words of Chriſt: *he that heareth you, heareth me.* Lu. 10. whence followes, that the words of the Apoſtles were the words of Chriſt. But Chriſt himſelf, Mat. 18. declares that text muſt be vnderſtood of his Church, whereuer it be: *if he vvil not heare the Church, let him be to you as a Heathen and Publican.* We proue it out of S. Iohn 14. 18. *He vvill giue you an other Paraclet, the ſpirit of truth, that vvill a*

byde vvith you for euer; but this text playnly declares that the Promiſs was made alſo to the Church in ſucceeding ages, by the word *for euer*; for the Apoſtles were not to be *for euer* in their own perſons, but in their ſucceſſors; and to remoue all occaſion of cauilling vpon the word *for euer*, ſaying that it ſignifyes only the tyme of the Apoſtles lyues, Chriſt declares himſelf in a cleerer expreſſion, Mat. 28. *I am vvith you all dayes to the conſummation of the vvorld* giuing vs to vnderſtand, that the Paraclet was not ſent to his Apoſtles alone, but to their ſucceſſors to the words end. Wee proue it by the text of S. Io. 16. 26. *vvhen the Paraclet vvill come, vvhom I vvill ſend from my Father the ſpirit of Truth, vvho proceedeth from the Father, he vvill giue teſtimony of me, and you vvill giue teſtimony*. But there is nothing more cleer, than that the whole Chapter ſpeakes all a long of the Church; (reade, y pray, the text) conſequently that text is to be vnderſtood of the Church, as well as of the Apoſtles. Wee proue it, becauſe the Apoſtles were the fundation (S. Paul Eph. 2. 20.) whervpon the Church was built: But S. Paul calls the the Church alſo the Pillar and foundation of Truth 1. Tim. 3. Wee proue it becauſe

S. Paul commands vs in ſeueral places to beliewe his doctrin, for that *his vvord is not the vvord of Man, but indeed of God*, and conſequently infallible. 1. Theſ. 2. but Chriſt alſo Mat. 23 commands vs to obey and beliewe the Church in ſucceeding ages: *on the chayr of Moyſes haue ſate the ſcribes and Phariſee, vvhateuer they bid you do, obſerue and do*, obliging vs to obey and beliewe not only Moyſes, but thoſe that *ſucceede in his chayr*. Thus not a text ſhall you meet for the infallibility of the Apoſtles, but proues lykwiſe that of the Church.

Doubtleſs you will not deny, but that Chriſt hisCommand of *teaching all Nations, preaching the Ghoſpell*, that *the Bishops ſhould rule the Church*, was layd not only on the Apoſtles, but on their ſucceſſors for future ages; otherwyſe the Prelats and Paſtors of future, and this our age would not be obliged to *teach preach*, and *rule* vs. You will not deny alſo, but that Chriſt his command of hearing theChurch vnder payn of being eſteemed Heathens and Publicans, of obeying them that ſit on Moyſes his chayr, of being ſubiect to our Prelats, was layd on the flock of all ſucceeding ages, as well as on that of the Apoſtles dayes: it follows therefore that the Paſtors of our age are

as much obliged to teach vs, as the Apoſtles were to preach to them of their age; and that wee are as much obliged to obey and beliue the Church in our age, as the flock was in the Apoſtles tyme to beliue and obey them: who can doubt them but that as the Authority, iuriſdiction, and obligation of teaching deſcended to ſucceeding ages, the infallibility alſo giuen to the Apoſtles for to acquit that obligation, did deſcend; it being giuen by God, for the loue and gouernment of the flock, that they should not be mis lead. And heere enters the argument that I propoſed in the former Chapter. Whoeuer does as Chriſt bids him do, and belieues as Chriſt bids him beliue, cannot do amiſs, nor beliue an errour; but Chriſt bids vs do and beliue, as the Church in ſucceeding ages bids vs do and beliue; therefore wee cannot do amiſs, nor beliue an errour, conſequently they cannot mislead vs.

But ſaies our Aduerſary, the Paraclet was to remayn with the Church vntill *all truth* was taught neceſſary for ſaluation; but it cannot be doubted but that the Paraclet taught the Apoſtles all truth, and they deliuered thoſe Truths in their written word. Therefore after that word was

deliuered to vs, the Paraclet was to remayne no longer. This obiection well vnderstood, will giue light to our doctrin, and manifestly confirm its truth.

Christ saies Io. 15. 15. that he taught his Apostles all whatsoeuer he had heard from his Father: it's manifest therefore he taught them all truths necessary for saluation: this was before his Passion, and yet after his Resurrection, S. Luke c. 24. tells vs, that in his iourny to *Emaus* with the two Disciples he interpreted the passages of Scripture to them, which signifyes, that through inaduertency or forgetfullnes wee may come to doubt, euen of what truths were already taught: nay he saies Io. 16. 12. that he had as yet, things to declare to them; and that the Holy spirit, when he came, would teach them all truth. Behold how Christ, hauing sayd he taught all things, yet he sayes, that he had many things to open to them, which they could not then learne, vntill the Paraclet came. This might seeme a contradiction, but is none: for when he sayd that he taught them all he had heard from his Father, that is to be vnderstood, that he taught and deliuered to them the General Principles and Truths of Faith, wherin all truths of Religion were contained; and

what he had yet to say to them, were the consequences, and particular Truths of Faith contained in those general Principles, which the Paraclet would disclose to them, its therfore that the Holy Ghost is called by the Fathers, Basil. 5. cont. Eunom: and Mar. vict: 3. contra *Arium*, the *Interpreter*, and *Voyce* of the Son because the interpreter sayes nothing of his own, but deliuers in expresser terms, what the Author has already sayd: and the text cleerly sayes, the Paraclet taught nothing of the new, but what he had heard. *Non enim loquetur à semetipso, sed quæcunque audierit loquetur*: because he did but expound in particular, what Christ had taught in general Principles, and opened to the Apostles the consequences that were contained in them.

Now its manifest out of the text, that the Paraclet when he descended did not of a sudain open to the Apostles all the Truths and consequences included in those General Principles deliuered by Christ; or if he did, that he did not so cleerly, as that they should haue vnderstood all; for after that descent, wee read Act. 10. that Peter doubted, if the Ghospell ought to be preached to the Gentiles, and he was in-

ſtructed by a heauenly viſion, it ought: alſo Act. 15. it was doubted if beſids Baptiſm, the Faith full were to be circumcided. But wee do freely grant that the Apoſtles had at length a full and perfect knowledge of all truths of our Faith, and all the conſequences included in thoſe general Principles deliuered to them by Chriſt: conſequently there is no Truth of Faith which now is belieued by us, or shall be belieued by future Ages, but the Apoſtles did diſtinctly and particularly know; for as Tertul. ſayes, l. de præſer. c. 22. *quis integræ mentis credere poteſt, aliquid eos ignoraſſe, quos Magiſtros Dominus dedit: vvhat man of a ſound vvit, can belieue, that they vvere ignorant of any thing vvhom the Lord gaue vs for Maſters*: wee confeſs alſo, that the Apoſtles did teach and deliuer all thoſe truths to their diſciples either by their written word; or by word of Mouth to be handed to Poſterity by Tradition. whence S. Paul 2. Theſ. 2. commands, *hold the Traditions vvhich ye haue learned, vvheter by Epiſtles, or by vvord of Mouth*: ſome of theſe truths, in ſucceding ages either through forgetfullneſs, or through inaduertency of their Diſciples, and their ſucceſſors (who minded chiefly thoſe Articles

ticles, that were opposed by Hereticks and laboured in declaring them, and neglected the others,) came to be only confusedly knowen and not so exactly, as they were deliuered by the Apostles; and this occasions, and has in all ages occasioned disputes in Religion.

When therefore the Church in Generall Councils declares an Article of Faith, it does not, as our Aduersaryes calumny vs, coyn a new Article; it ads nothing to what the Apostles deliuered; but it declares to the Disputants in Religion, what was antiently taught and belieued by the Apostles, and was forgotten or misvnderstood by others. Doubts in Religion, are but Doubts of what the Apostles did teach, some say onething, others an other: what wee pretend is, that wheras these doubts haue been in all ages and euer will be; there has been, and euer will be an infallible Church to ascertain vs, which is the true Doctrin; for though the Apostles knew all Truths, and taught them, either by *vvord of Mouth*, or in *vvriting*; what Doctrin they deliuered *verbally*, or by *vvord of Mouth*, is doubted of by Posterity; if *This*, or *That* be of *Apostolicall Tradition*; alsoe the *vvritten*

vvord is questioned, if *This*, or *That* Part of Scripture be truely *Canonical*: what wee pretend is, that as, though Christ taught all *Truths* to his Apostles, yet he sent an infallible interpreter (the *Paraclet*) after his *Ascension*, to assist and direct them in case of any Doubts arising of those *Truths*, to declare vnto them the true sence of the *Truths* which he taught them: That as, though the *Paraclet* taught all *Truths* to the Apostles, yet he still remayned with them to direct them, if any doubts should occurr against those *Truths*; and as, though the Apostles taught to their Disciples all those *Truths*, yet the *Protestants* themselues confess it was needfull, they should haue left an infallible *vvritten vvord*, to inform and ascertain vs what Doctrin the Apostles did teach: so wee pretend that, though the Apostles haue taught *verbally* and by their *vvritten vvord* all *Truths* of Religion, yet since that wee see Tis douted what the Apostles did teach *verbally*, and which is their *vvritten Doctrin*, it was absolutly needfull there should be left to vs after their departure an *infallible Guide* and *Instructor* for to ascertain vs, which is the *Doctrin* and *vvritten vvord* of the Apostles, and the true sence of that *vvritten vvord*;

which infallible Guide and inſtructor wee ſay, is the Church, conſtantly aſſiſted by Gods infallible Spirit. So long therefore ſhall the Church be aſſiſted with that Spirit, to direct vs, as there ſhall be doubts againſt Religion, which will be, *for euer.*

VII. CHAPTER.

THAT THE ROMAN CATHOLICK Church is the true Church appointed to teach vs: Infallible in all Points of Religion.

BY the Roman Catholick Church, wee do not vndeſtand the Dioces of *Rome*, as Mr Sall willfully miſtakes; but the whole Congregation of Faith full ſpred trough-hout the world, vnited in *Faith* and *Communion* with the Pope as their Head; and becauſe he reſides in *Rome*, this Congregation takes the de nomination of *Roman*: as, though an Army be quartered twenty myles round, the Camp takes its denomination from the head-quarter, where the General lodges. This Church, wee ſay, is the Church which Chriſt eſtabliſhed to teach vs what Truths he reuealed: for that Church eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, which floriſhed in the Apoſtles tyme, is it now ex-

tant or not? if not wee all labour in vayn in prouing each of vs, that his won Church is the true and Primitiue Church; if it be, it muſt be infallible as that was: but no other Church but the Roman Church pretends to be infallible; nay they lowdly diſclaym infallibility; therefore no other is the true Church but the Roman Catholick.

Yow ſay the *True Church* is infallible in *Fundamental* Points; that *Your* Church is ſo far infallible, and no other Church can iuſtly claym to any more; conſequently that yours is the true Church. But I reply; the Scripture ſayes the Church is infallible, and you now in ſome meaſure do conſeſs it: the Scripture does not limit that infallibility to points fundamental; nay ſayes the Paraclet shall leade her to *all Truth*. by what Authority do you make that reſtriction? the Apoſtles and Church in their tyme was infallible in all Points *Fundamental* and not *Fundamental* they taught as well the *chiefe* and *prime* Articles of Faith as the *inferiour Truths*; they writ the new Teſtament which contains both kind of Articles *Fundamental* and not *Fundamental*; and which is infallibly true in whatcuer it contains; and they were

no leſs infallible in what they taught *verbally*, then in what they *vvrit*; wheras S. Paul commands vs to hold faſt the *Traditions* receiued from them, whether by *vvritten Epiſtles*, or by *ſpeech*. 2. Theſ. 2. Now I ask were the Apoſtles infallible in the Points not *fundamental* and *inferiour* Truths that they taught, or not? if not, Scripture is not infallible in thoſe points, nor could S. Paul ſay when he preached points not *fundamental*, that *their vvord vvas indeed the vvord not of men, but of God*; for the word that is not infallibly true, is not Gods word. If they were infallible, then the Church in the Apoſtles tyme was infallible in all points *fundamental* and not: either that Church therefore is not now extant, and ſo wee labour in vayn in pretending it is, or there is a Church now extant infallible in all doctrin of Religion *fundamental* and not; which can be ne other but the Roman Church, wheras Proteſtants and all other ſectaryes owns themſelues to be fallible.

infallible

You anſwer again, its the ſame Church as to the *ſubſtance* and *eſſence* of a Church, which requires only to be infallible in *fundamental* points, as yours is; but I will proue that it is as repugnant to the *eſſence*

of the true Church to be fallible or fals in ſmale articles of Faith as in great ones: I ſay in *ſmale* articles of Faith; for to teach a doctrin to be an article of Faith, is to teach it is reuealed by God: but it is impoſſible the true Church, should teach any doctrin ſmale or great to be a reuealed Truth, which is an vntruth, and not really reuealed by God becauſe the Church is commiſſioned by God to teach vs *his doctrin*, what he has reuealed; and for that purpoſe has giuen her the Mark and Seale of his Commiſſion, which are Miracles, wherby to confirm their doctrin, by which God moues men to embrace and belieue the Church which teacheth. No proof more certain and ſtrong of the true Faith, Church, and Religion, than Miracles wrought in confirmation of it: when Moyſes, Ex. 4. 1. ſaid, *They vvill not belieue me, nor heare my voyce:* God gaue him the gift of Miracles as a mark and ſign that he was ſent by him. when Elias rayſed the dead Child to lyfe (3. Reg. 17. 24.) the Mother cryed out; *novv in this I haue knovven, thou art a man of God, and the vvord of our Lord in thy mouth is true.* Chriſt being asked if he was the Meſſias, proued himſelf to be ſuch, by the Miracles he wrought, Mat.

11. 3. *The blind ſee, the lame vvalk, the Leapers are made cleane, the deafe heare, and the dead ryſe again.* S. Paul 2. Cor. 12. 12. calls the Miracles which he wrought, *the ſigns of his Apoſtle ship*, and S. Mar. laſt ch. ſaies that the Apoſtles preaching euery where wrought Miracles in confirmation of their doctrin. Chriſt to proue againſt the Scribes and Phariſees (Mat. 9. 6.) that he had power of forgining ſins, which they denied, cured the ſick Man of the Palſie, *That you may knovv that the ſon of Man hath povver of forgining ſins, ſaith he to the ſick of the Palſie, Aryſe, take up thy bed, and go to thy houſe.* Therefore if the Catholik Church does work Miracles in proof of the doctrin she teaches, tis an vnqueſtionable truth, that she is the true Church (as Nicodemus concluded, Io. 3. 2. *No man could do thoſe things if God vvere not vvith him.*) and that no man can deny or doubt her doctrin to be from God: wherefore Chriſt (Mat. 11. 21. pronounced *VVo* againſt *Corozain* and *Betſaida*, becauſe they did not beliue his doctrin to be diuine, which they did ſee confirmed with ſo many Miracles you ſay they were no true Miracles, but Sorceries and Enchantments, or that the Authors were miſtaken in iudging them to

be Miracles which were but Natural effects of natural cauſes. But I anſwer that nothing can be ſaid againſt thoſe Miracles wrought by the Profeſſors of our Religion, and related by S. Auguſtin, S. Bernard and other Saints of the Church, which may not be alſo obiected againſt the Miracles of our B. Sauiour and Apoſtles. Could not the inhabitants of *Corozain* and *Bethſaida* ſay, that the Miracles which Chriſt alleadged, were but Sorceries, or effects of natural cauſes? did not the Scribs and Phariſees ſay it? to conclude, if they were true Miracles, Tis euident the doctrin in whoſe confirmation they were wrought, is diuine; and all things conſidered, you will find, its rashneſs to deny that they were true Miracles, if you read carefully this Chap.

Now it is impoſſible that God, who is infinitly *True*, and to whoſe infinit Veracity it is as repugnant to ſpeake a ſmale vntruth as a great one, should confirm any vntruth, euerſo ſmale, with a Miracle; conſequently a Church that would deliuer a mixt doctrin, of ſome great *Truths*, and ſome *ſmale vntruths*, it is impoſſible that God should work Miracles by that Church, in confirmation of her doctrin; for that would be to own that doctrin for his

own, and owne ſmale vntruths to be reuealed by him, wheras he giues his commiſſion, and his ſeale and Marks of his authority for to teach them: And as it is not credible that the King of England should giue his commiſſion vnder the broad ſeale of England to any man to induce his ſubiect into a Rebellion, ſo its leſs imaginable that God should giue his commiſſion. with his broad ſeale, which are Miracles and ſupernatural ſigns, to teach an vntruth euer ſo ſmale; his infinit veracity being ſo auerſe to all vntruth. By no other means did he confirm the doctrin of the Trinity to be his doctrin, by no other ſigns did he moue men to belieue, than by working Miracles by the Church that taught it; if therefore he works miracles by the Church that teachs *Purgatory, real Preſēc*, and others, which you call inferiour points and ſmale errours, he confirms that doctrin to be his, and ſo approues and ownes ſmale vntruths to be reuealed by him. Therefore S. Paul when he preached as well great, as inferiour Truths or articles, could cōfidently ſay, that his words were indeed the words of God, becauſe God did cōfirm his doctrin by Miracles and ſupernatural ſigns: particularly Mr Sall auerring that the doctrin of Pur-

gatory and real Preſence are damnable errours, if ignorance doth not excuſe the Profeſſors, certainly God would not giue the Marks of his Commiſſion (which are Miracles) to teach them. It remayns that wee proue, God has wroutght Miracles by the Roman Catholik Church, euen in thoſe ages, wherin the Proteſtants affirm that she was plung'd in errours; and in confirmation of thoſe Tenets, which they ſay are errors. Secondly that wee are bound to belieue them to haue been true Miracles; thirdly that the doctrin in whoſe confirmation they were wrought muſt be true reuealed doctrin.

As to the firſt, wee ſpeake not of forged Miracles, which haue been, and are ſtill condemn'd by the Church, and their Authors punisht as impoſtors; wee ſpeake of vncontrolled Miracles wrought in the preſence of the very Authors (and Authors of an vnſpotted credit, Holy neſs and learning, euen in the opinion of our Aduerſaries) who relate them in their works left to Poſterity. S. Auguſtin l. 22. de Ciuit. Dei c. 8. relates, that in his own tyme, many miracles were wrought, and ſom in his own preſence, by the *Sacramens* of the Church, by the *interceſsion* of Saints, and

their *Relicks*, eſpecially of ſaint Stephen, of ſaint Geruaſe and Protaſe, when (he being then in the towne) their Bodies were by a heauenly reuelation diſcouered to ſaint Ambroiſe at *Milan*: by the ſign of the *Holy Croſs*, by the ſacrifice of *Maſs*, and *Earth* of Chriſt's ſepulcher; and mentions in particular (beſids others) that a woman called *Palladia* was ſudainly cured by praying to S. Stephen, *Ad ſanctum Martyrem orare perrexerat, quæ mox vt cancellos attigit ſana ſurrexit.* S. Bernard in ſaint Malachy's lyfe relates many Miracles wrought by this Saint; and that he himſelf, after the Saint expired, took his hand, and layd it vpon the withered and vſeleſs hand of a boy then preſent, who was preſently reſtored to perfect health. The Miracles wrought by S. Bernard himſelf in confirmation of the Catholick doctrin of *Tranſubſtantion* and *Inuocation of Saints*, oppoſed in his tyme by the *Henricians*, and *VValdenſes*, are recorded by God fred in vita S. Bern. l. 3. c. 5. and particularly, that ſtupendious Miracle of *Sarlatum*, a village neer *Toulouſe*, when the Saint bleſſing ſom loaues of bread, he ſaid to the multitude that were preſent. *In this you ſhall knovv that theſe things*, (meaning thoſe Tenets oppoſed

by thē foreſaid Hereticks) *are true, and thoſe falſe, vvhich the Heretiks endeuour, to perſvvade you that vvhoſoeuer of your diſeaſed perſons, ſhall taſt of theſe loaues, they ſhall be healed:* and the Bishop of *Chartres* (his freind) then preſent, adding that the promiſe was conditional, prouided they did eat of that bread with Faith, the Saint replyed; that *he did ſpeak vvithout any ſuch reſtriction, that his meaning vvas, that vvhoſoeuer did taſt of them loaues should bo cured of his ſickneſs.* And effectualy, as many ſick perſons as did eat of the loaues, were cured ; and this Miracle being publisht, ſuch a multitude flockt to meet the Saint from all parts, that he was forct to decline the common road. No leſs authentick is that paſſage of *S. Damaſcen*, related by *Iohn Hieroſolymitanus* in the lyfe of *Damaſcenus*, his own ſcholler and priuy to all his lyfe. *Leo Iſauraus* thar great perſecutor of Images, vnderſtanding that *Damaſcen* was very actiue in defending their worship, and that he had writ learnedly in the defence of that Tenet; conterfeited a letter, as written by *Damaſcen* vnto him, inuiting him to ſurpriſe the Citty of *Damaſco*, wherof he was Gouernor; this letter *Leo Iſaurus* ſent vnto *Hiſiam*, *Caliph*, or King of the *Saracens*,

whose subiect *Damscen* was; prouing thence the Treachery of *Damascen*, and his own sincerity and honesty in detesting so execrable an action of a subiect against so deseruing a Prince: *Hisiam* astonisht that *Damascen* should be capable of so base an action, consulted his Councellers, concluded him guilty, and condemn'd him to the forfeiture of his Means and Imployments, and that his right hand should be cut of, and nayld to a gibet in the Market place; which being executed, the saint retyred to his house, humbly beg'd of *Hisiam* that his hand might be restored to him; this was granted; and the saint betaking himself to his *Oratory*, prostrated before the Picture of our B. Lady, earnestly prayed her, that that hand, which by the malice of *Leo Isaurus* he had lost for defending the honor of her and the saints Images might be restored to him; which. He promised he would continually imploy in defending that Doctrin against the Heresy of the *Iconoclasts*: he fell asleep; and the Mother of God appearing to him, said; *Thy petition is granted, and they hand restored; but remember to imploy it, according to they promise, in vvriting against the impiety of those vvho iniure vs by their vn vvorthy*

demeanor towards our Images: awaked out of his sleep he found his hand as perfectly vnited to his arm, as euer it hath been. This Miracle was diuulged; *Damascen* call'd by *Hisiam*; and after so supernatural a testimony of his Innocency, restored to his former dignities and Means; all which he renounced; gaue his Means to the Poore, and became a Priest, and a great Opposer of the Iconoclasts. There is hardly any age of the Church but affords vs the lyke Miracles wrought by the Roman Catholicks in confirmation of our Doctrin: it were tedions to rehearse more, especially when these now related are sufficient for the present subiect.

That these things happen'd (whither they were true Miracles or no, wee do not dispute now) but that such things as wee haue related, did really happen, no sober man can deny it; for certainly he would be held for an obstinat fool that would say, there was no such man as Cæsar or Cicero in the world; that he neuer fought with Pompey; for which wee haue no other warrant, but the testimony of Heathen Authors (for no Christian did euer see them) and none but a mad man will deny but S. Agustin, S. Bernard, Iohn-

Hieroſolimitanus and other ſaints and learned D. Doctors that writ the forementioned paſſages, and others of the ſame kind in ſeueral other ages, are as much deſeruing of credit, as the Heathens: and if you did meet in S. Auguſt. S. Bern. and other ſaints, that the *figuratiue preſence* was belieued in their ages, and ſuch as belieued *Purgatory*, were punisht, doutleſs you would belieue them, and cry victory againſt vs; it can not then be, but preiudice that will hinder you from belieuing thoſe paſſages did happen, wheras they do in their writtings teſtify they happen'd in their own preſence. what caracter would he deſerue, who would ſay, there was no ſuch man as william the Conqueror in England; no ſuch thing, as wars betwixt france an England in Ancient tyms; no ſuch things a spanish fleet defeated by the English, in Queen Elizabeths tyme and Philip the ſecond of Spain. would not you iudge ſuch à man to be mad: for all this wee haue no other warrant but Hiſtories; and the Authors were not, more honeſt, learned, wyſe and holy than *S. Auguſtin*, *Bern*: and other ſaints who relate Miracles wrought in all-ages-can he then deſerue a better caracter, than

of a mad man or fool that will deny them? moreouer either S. Auguſtin, S. Bern, and the other ſaints that relate thoſe Miracles, did belieue the Tenets of *Inuocation of ſaints*, *adoration of Images*, and *real Preſence* of Chriſt's body in the Sacrament or not? if they did, then you confeſs that the ſaints now raigning in heauen, and confeſſed by you to be ſaints, and none of the ſimple ſort, but learned wyſe men, did belieue and were ſaued in the belief of our Tenets: if they did not belieue them; what end or aduantage could they haue in feigning thoſe Miracles: wee muſt therefore confeſs, thoſe things did happen, in their own preſence as they ſay. Laſtly the Proteſtant Doctors do not deny but ſuch things did happen; but they ſay they were no true Miracles: the Centuriſts, and Oſiander in Epit. cent. 9. 10. 11. pag. 213. *the Miracles vvhich ſuperſtitious Monks relate, are either feigned Miracles, or vvrought by Satans enchantments to eſtablish vvicked vvorship of Images, Inuocation of ſaints &c. not that I think S. Bernard vvas a Magician* (*ſaies Oſiander* Cent. 12. pag. 310.) *but that I think it probable, Satan vvrought the Miracles, vvherby the ſaint himſelf, and others vvere deceiued.*

Suppoſed

Suppoſed then, that ſuch things did really happen, wee will proue they were, and wee are bonnd to belieue they were true Miracles: for this you cannot deny, but that S. *Auguſt. S. Bern: Iohn Hieroſol.* and *God fred.* who were wyſe learned, Holy D. Doctors did know what a Miracle was, as well as you: thoſe ſaints, and the ſaints of other ages were ey wittneſs of what paſs'd, they examined narrowly the paſſages, and their circumſtances; thy iudged them to be true Miracles; muſt not wee belieue them to haue been ſuch, rather than your iugdment, who did not ſee the paſſages, nor was not born many hundred years after? and what is to be obſerued, that when *Damaſcens* hand was reſtored, and *S. Bernard* cured the ſick by the laoues he bleſſed; is it poſſible, if theſe had not been notorious miracles, but enchantments, that ſom *Iconoclaſt*, and ſom *Henrician* or *vvaldenſes*, againſt whoſe Doctrin they were wrought, should not haue examined and diſcouered the cheat? *S. Bernard* had many Enemyes in france, all the *Henricians*, and *Apoſtolici*, *vvaldenſes*; *Damaſcen* had the Emperor *Leo* for Enemy and all the *Iconoclaſts*, and not only them but in the wery Citty of *Damaſco*, all the Ambitious

Courtiers; who enuyed his greatneſs, and preſſed *Hiſiam* to cut of his hand: and can it be imagined that none of all theſe should haue writ or published if that paſſage was a cheat and no knowen miracle? or by what means did the *Centuriſts*, *Oſiander*, and *Proteſtants* in our age, come to diſcouer they were all but enchantments, which the enemyes of thoſe Saints, that then liued, could not diſcouer? Once that *Luther* in Germany thought to cheat the world, and make men believe he could caſt out Deuils, the cheat was diſcouered and many writers of that tyme did relate it. Once that *Caluin* in *Geneua* thought to delude the world, and shew that he could rayſe the dead, he bryb'd a man to feign himſelf dead, that he might be thought to rayſe him to lyfe; but the man was found dead in good earneſt, and the fourberie published by many writers. And thoſe Miracles related by Saints and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, had they been Sorceries and enchantments, is it poſſible that the Hereticks, againſt whoſe Doctrin they were wrought, or ſom one then liuing should not haue diſcouered it?

This you cannot deny, but that *Herod*, and many Iews, who neuer did ſee our

Sauiour work any Miracles, nor hear him preach, were bound to belieue, and obſtinat for not belieuing our Sauiors Miracles and Doctrin; only vpon this account, that they were credibly informed by thoſe who were ey witneſs of his Miracles and doctrin; notwithſtanding that the *Scrib* and *Phariſees* ſaid, they were wrought by the Deuil: wheras therefore S. *Auguſtin*, S. *Bernard*, and the Saints of other ages, are as credible Witneſſes as thoſe Iews were that related the Miracles of Chriſts, and could iudge and know what a miracle was, as well as thoſe Iews, do inform you that thoſe true miracles were wrought in thoſe ages in confirmation of our Catholik Tenets, and that, in their preſence; you are bound to belieue they were true miracles, and obſtinat in not belieuing them. To ſay, as the *Centuriſts* and *Oſiander*, that theſe miraculous works were Sorceries and enchantments, is a moſt deſperat aſſertion; firſt it is to make the Saints and Fathers of antiquity (who relates them as wrought in their owne preſence, examined by them, and iudged to be true miracles) meer fools, that were deceiued, and knew not to diſtinguish betwixt a true miracle, and a Sorcery: Secondly what rule or way hath

Oſiander and the *Centuriſts* got, to know thoſe paſſages to be enchantments and not true miracles, which S. *Auguſtin*, S. *Bernard* and other Saints had not? Thirdly, Chriſt appayed the hungar of a multitude with few loaues which he bleſſed; S. Bernard cured the diſeaſes of a multitude by the loaues, which he bleſt: let vs abſtract from the Authors of theſe two actions; let the actions be conſidered by a learned Pagan Philoſopher, who belieues not in Chriſt; will not he iudge them both to be equally miraculous, or both to be but enchantments? I conclude what all wyſe learned holy men, (and eſpecially euen the aduerſaries alſo of the Author) do iudge, after an exact examin of all circumſtances, to be a true miracle; it is willfull obſtinacy to deny it be ſuch: but the fore named Saints, and they of all other ages (as will appeare if you read the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories) haue iudged miracles to be truly wrought in each age, ſom haue been eywitneſſes of miracles, other haue examined and enquired what they were, and their circumſtances, and iudged them to be ſuch: S. Iohn Damaſcen, and S. Bernards enemyes againſt whom they preached and writ, did not deny them to be ſuch. Therefore wee cannot

without obſtinacy deny them.

Now, that wee are obliged to believe the doctrin in whoſe confirmation they wee wrought, its proued by what is ſaid; and that if wee be not obliged to believe Catholeciſme, its moſt apparent, wee are not obliged to believe Chriſtianity; for by the ſelf ſame arguments by which you proue, againſt a Pagan, the Chriſtian Religion to be true, wee alſo proue, the Catholick to be true: conſequently either the Catholick muſt be true or the Chriſtian is not: by what were the Iews and Gentiles perſwaded, that Chriſtianity was reuealed by God? becauſe it was preached hy Holy men, of great ſanctity of lyfe, of great auſterity, of no attache to the world or wordly things, of admirable virtue, and who confirmed their doctrin with ſupernatural ſigns and Miracles: but S. Bernard who preached the *Inuocation of Saints*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, and veneration of *Relicks*, againſt the *Henricians*, was a great Saint; witneſs *VVhitaker* de Eccl. pag. 369. *I do realy believe S. Bernard vvas a true Saint.* *Oſiander*, Cent. 12. *Saint Bernard Abot of Clareual vvas a very pious man.* *Gomarus* in ſpeculo Eccl. pag. 23. *One pious man your Church had in many years Bernard a Saint.*

Paſquils return into Engl. pag. 8. *he vvas one of the lamps of Gods Church. S. Auguſtin* was confeſſedly a great ſaint, S. *Iohn Damaſcen* that writ ſeueral learned Treatiſes againſt the *Iconoclaſts* for the worship of Images, S. *Malachias*, S. *Thomas Aquinas* and S. *Francis Xauerius*, who conuerted ſo many Kingdoms in the Indies to the Catholick Religion, at that very tyme, that Luther reuolted from the Church; all theſe, and many more great Saints preached the Catholick Religion and confirmed it with many Miracles, as wee haue related and the Hiſtories do manifeſt: therefore wee haue as ſtrong motiues to perſuade the truth of Catholick Religion, as you haue to proue the truth of Chriſtian Religion; both therefore muſt be belieued, or neither.

Can any man iudge it conſiſtent with the goodneſs of God, to permit *Tranſubſtantiation* and the worship of *Saints* and *Images*, if they were falſe doctrin, to be propoſed to men, by great and Holy Saints, and confirmed by ſo many miracles; when by the very ſelf ſame means and motiues of credibility, he propoſes to vs Chriſtianity; wherby men muſt find themſelues equally obliged to belieue both or neither?

nor will it be an euaſion, to ſay that the Miracles wrought in fauor of Chriſtianity were true miracles, and thoſe which were wrought for Popery, were but enchantments and ſorceries; for abſtracting from Faith, which obliges vs to belieue that the miracles wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles were *true* miracles, our ſenſes and Natural reaſon cannot but iudge the reſtitution of Damaſcens hand, the healing of the ſick by the loaues bleſt by S. Bernard to be as true miracles, as any that was wrought by the Apoſtles; and therefore they were iudged by all wyſe men of thoſe ages to be ſuch: and abſtracting from Faith as I ſaid, what reaſon can be alleadged for to ſay, the one were true miracles, and the others not?

I conclude with this diſcourſe: as Children are obliged in conſcience to honor their Parents, (its Gods commandment) ſo you are obliged in conſcience to belieue that Doctrin to be true, which is confirmed by true Miracles: for as wee formerly diſcourſed, its impoſſible that God should confirm falſe Doctrin with true Miracles, that being repugnant to his infinit *veracity*, to confirm a lye with the ſeal, and marks of his Commiſſion to teach it: but

for your obligation of honoring this particular Man and woman, who are your Parents; its not requisit you haue euidence, and infallible assurance, that they are your Parents; its sufficient for your obligation, that you are morally certain, they are yours; and this moral assurance which you haue, is grounded only vppon the testimony of honest people that informs you of it: the lyke you haue, that true Miracles haue been wrought in many ages in confirmation of those Tenets of ours, which you call erroneous; the testimony of great saints, as honest men as those, who tell you that these are your Parents; therefore you are obliged to believe that doctrin is true, in whose confirmation those Miracles were wrought.

You reply; this makes our Faith of that doctrin but fallible Faith; for if I haue no more assurance of the truth of those Tenets, than I haue of the Miracles that were wrought in confirmation of them; of the truth of those Miracles, I only haue a moral assurance grounded vpon the testimony and iudgment of those saints which relate them; all which is but fallible; for it might happen they were deceiued; consequently all the certainty I haue of the

truth of the Tenets, is but a moral and fallible certainty; and ſo our Faith is not infallibly true. I anſwer, the motiue of my Faith, and ground wher vpon it is bottom'd, is only the voyce of God pronounced by the Church, which deliuers that doctrin of God; which Motiue and ground is infallibily true. But becauſe this Motiue is obſcure, and does not appeare euidently and certainly to the vnderſtanding that it does exiſt, the vnderſtanding cannot aſſent vnto it, vntill it be made more knowen, and the way to make is more knowen, is not to make it euident that it *exiſts*; for the Motiue of Faith muſt be obſcure, and it is againſt the eſſence and nature of Faith, to be euident, or the Motiue of it to be euidently propoſed to the vnderſtanding, as M. Anderton does moſt ſolidly and learnedly demonſtrat in his Treatiſe of *a ſoueraign remedy againſt Atheiſm and Hereſy*: The way therefore of making it more knowen, is to make it euidently credible, and lykely in the iudgment of any rational man, that ſuch a voyce of God ſpeaking by the Church, is extant: and this is don by the Miracles and ſupernatural ſigns, which the Church works in confirmation of her Doctrin; which are

vndeniable inducements to any man of reaſon to iudge it moſt credible and lykely, that it is God who ſpeaks by that Church: and our vnderſtanding being thus confirmed by this iudgment of credibility then follows our obligation of belieuing the Doctrin; the credibility of the exiſtence of Gods voyce by the Church, and our obligation of belieuing being thus propoſed by our vnderſtanding; The vnderſtanding is ſtill able to deny an aſſent to Gods voyce ſpeaking, becauſe nothing can force the vnderſtanding to an eſſent, but the euidence of the obiect; and its not euident to the vnderſtanding, that God ſpeakes, but *euidently credible*: therefore; the will muſt enter, which aſſiſted with the preuious iudgment of the credibility of the doctrin, and *a pious inclination* from God, for to reſolue, commands the vnderſtanding to aſſent to Gods voyce speaking, in which command of the will determining the vnderſting to Aſſent, the Merit of Faith doth conſiſt. So that the whole and only Motiue of our aſſent of Faith, is Gods voyce speaking by the Church: the Miracles and other ſupernatural ſigns, are not the Motiues of our Faith, but of our Iudgement of credibility, and of our obligation

of believing a Doctrin so credibly proposed: which Iudgment of credibility and obligation of believing, need not to be absolutly and Metaphisically euident, but morally euident in the highest degree of Moral euidence, as it is in this case, that true Miracles haue been wrought in many, or most ages by the Catholick Church in confirmation of her Tenets. Reade the *Resolution* of Faith in the 2. part of thise Treatise.

Your obligation of believing the Miracles of the Church being thus proued, your obligation of believing her infallible in all points of Doctrin, is most apparent: for God, whose veracity is infinit, cannot speake the least vntruth, nor deliuer it as his Doctrin, nor giue his commission to teach it; nor confirm it with the markes and seale of his Commission, for that would be to owne it te be his Doctrin reuealed by him; wheras therefore he has confirmed the Doctrin of the Catholick Church with so many Miracles, its impossible it should contain the least vntruth.

And when you would be so obstinat, as to doubt of all other Miracles, you cannot be so blind, as to doubt of the conuersion of all Nations that euer were conuerted to Christianity, by the Catolick

Church; what Nation was there euer yet conuerted to Christianity by the Protestant Church? or in what History do you read that euer you sent Preachers to conuert Pagans? it was S. Austin, a *Massing* Priest sent by Pope Gregory the Great, that conuerted England to Christianity; if you belieue the Chronicles of England: it was S. Xauerius a Iesuit, (to whom Sectaries haue no relation, if you will not make him Father of the *Quakers*) that conuerted the Indies; it was S. Patrick sent by Pope Celestin, that conuerted Ireland; they were Priest and fryars and Monks that propagated the Ghospell, in whom Protestants haue no Interest, but what their reuolt from the Church has giuen them in their Lands and estates. what Miracles, what conuersion of Nations to Christianity, what succession of Pastors, since Christ his tyme, what General Councils that condemned Heresyes, can the Protestant Church shew? And is it possible, that God should haue giuen those glorious Marks of a true Church, to the Catholick Church, if it were not the true Church; and giue no visible Mark at all of a true Church to the Protestant, if it were the true one? both Churchs pretends to be the true, and seruel other

Congregations pretends to the ſame: has God giuen no viſible marks wherby to diſtinguiſh his true Church from fals ones? otherwyſe, why should wee be obliged to belieue *This*, to be the true Church, rather than *That* other? and can it be imagined, that he should haue giuen Miracles and ſupernatural ſigns to the Catholick Church, if it were the falſe one, and giue none to any other, if any other were the true Church.

Laſtly I proue that the Roman Catolick Church, is infallibly true in her Doctrin Purgatory, real Preſence, and any Doctrin though smale and inferiour you call it. The Catholick Church as you confeſs, is infallible in fundamental points of Religion, you ſay, (if you be a Proteſtant) that the Roman Church is ſtill a true Church becauſe it has not erred in the fundation or eſſential points of Faith. But if it did in any point whateuer, though ſmale you iudge it, it would err in fundamental articles of Religion: therefore it has not, nor cannot err in any whateuer: I proue the *Minor*. Its a fundamental article of Faith, that God is infinitly *true*, that he cannot tell an *vntruth*: but if the Doctrin of Purgatory were untrue, the Catholick Church

would teach that God deliuers an vntruth; for the Church teacheth, that Purgatory is a Doctrin reuealed by God; if therefore Purgatory be an vntruth, she teachs that God deliuered an vntruth; and consequently she errs in a fundamental article of Faith.

Now its tyme wee examin that impious Position of our new Minister, Mr Sall. he follows much the tract of Luther his Grand Reformer, not in that he should haue disputed with the Deuil as Luther did, in points of Religion, for the Deuil is not so kind but to the grand *Heresiarcks*: thus far he imitats Luther that, in the beginning of his Apostacy, his chief drift was a separation from the Catholick Church vpon any account whateuer; I say *vvhateuer*, for it is euident that the first Reformers had not fixed on any one settled Religion in opposition to the Catholick, wheras they were strugling and disputing for many years in seueral meetings, had to that purpose, to determin what ought to be belieued by all, and what articles of Popery ought to be denyed, and which not: which doth euidence, that their first drift was to separat from the Catholick, and their second endeauour was to find out some other Reli-

gion, wee haue the proof of this in the Chronocles of England, for their ſeparation from the Church of Rome began by the Schiſme of Henry the Eight, which was quite different from the Religion his ſucceſſor and Son Edward the 6. endeauoured to eſtablish; and this quite an other, from that which Queen Elizabeth introduced; for she would haue an Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, and other points denyed by the former: that which the Queen eſtablished, was fashioned to an other shape by King Iames and his ſucceſſors. Nay to this day the Sectaries, who ſtyle them ſelues *Reformed Religion*, do not agree, what Tenets muſt be held in opoſition to the Catholicks, but are ſufficiently Reformed by denying what the Catholick belieues. Thus doth Mr Sall proceed, for what he has propoſed to himſelf was a ſeparation, howeuer it should be, from the Church of Rome, but you will find in his diſcourſe that he is not yet throughly reſolued, what Religion to chuſe and what to belieue; not only becauſe that he has reſolued to be of the Church of England which is an *indiuiduum vagum* ready to change with all gouernments, but that in his Declaration he profeſſes to belieue the

39. Articles of the Church of England, and pag. 39. he ſayes, that the ſumme of his Faith is the written word of God and the plain vndubitable conſequences out of it and it is manifeſt that the 39. Articles are not plain vndubitable conſequences out of Gods written word: for, *a plain vndubitable conſequence*, is that, which, the Premiſſes being granted, is iudged by all wiſe, learned, vnderſtanding men, to follow out of the Premiſſes, and cannot be denyed be any wyſe vnderſtanding man; That in the Roman Catholick Church there are wyſe, learned men, it were a madneſs to deny it; but a far greater madneſs, to ſay that the Fathers and Doctors of all ages before thoſe 39. Articles were coyned, were not wyſe and learned men, that ſtudied and vnderſtood the Bible; and to all theſe the 39. Articles ſeems contrary to the word of God, ſo far they were, from iudging them *plain*, and *vndeniable conſequences* out of it: And the Lutherans, Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts and Huguenots of France, do not allow the 39. Articles of the Church of England, and conſequently do not iudge them to be *plain vndeniable conſequences out of Scripture*. So that you muſt ſay, that either all are a company of knaues that ſpeake againſt their

their conſciences, or that thoſe 39. Articles are not plain and vndeniable conſequences out of Scripture; conſequently Mr Salls ſome tymes belieues only Scripture, and its plain conſequences; ſometyms more.

But what proues that he is not yet throughly a Proteſtant (and ſo wee know not what he is, but a *Not Catholick*) is, his blaſphemous Poſition, *that there is not ſaluation in the Roman Catholick Religion*; for it is the conſtant doctrin of the Church of England that the Catholick Religion is a ſauing Religion: firſt, becauſe this has been euer yet their complaint againſt vs, that wee are vncharitable in denying ſaluation in their Church, and they extol their own charity for granting that in the profeſſion of Popery (prouided, he has no other ſin) a man may be ſaued. Secondly becauſe they confeſs, there was a true Church extant, the age that Luther began the Reformation, and all the precedent ages, for its an Article of our Creed, the conſtant Exiſtence of Gods Church, *I believe the Catholick Church*; and that there was no other Church then extant, but the Roman Catholick Church, they alſo confeſs it, and muſt grant it; for the *eſſence* of

the true Church consisting, as they say, in the due administration of the Sacraments, and preaching of the word of God; and no other Church being extant in Luthers age, and the precedent, that administred Sacraments or preached the Ghospell but the Roman Church; doubtless it must haue been the true Church; for in what Kingdom, Prouince, Citty, Village, Church or Chappell in the world was these things, or any of them, don by Protestants? its therefore the constant doctrin of Protestants, that Roman Catholick Church was then the true Church, and is now a true Church, for its the same now that then it was. Now, that a man may be saued in the true Church of God, prouided his lyfe be good, it were a blasphemy to deny it; consequently its a blasphemy to say, that in the Roman Church a man may not be saued; and it were to say that all our Ancestors, for so many ages, all the Fathers Doctors and saints confessed by the Protestants shem selues to be saints, were all damned.

Neither can Mr Sall excuse his Blasphemy, and cure the wound with that plaister of *Ignorance* which he applyes, saying that Papists (pag. 116.) may be excu-

sed by ignorance; and this smale comfort, he will not grant but to the *simple sort*, and not at all to the learned men. So that none of our Ancestors were saued for the space of so many hundred years, no saints that are confessed by both Parties to be such, if they were not fooles and ignorant people of the *simple sort*; wherby all the wyse and learned Fathers and Doctors of the precedent ages, and of this age are absolutly damned. Nay and *Thomas Aquinas*, which he him self styles a *saint*, and none of the *simple sort*, but a learned Doctor, who confessedly was a Papist is also damn'd. Its impossible that his Auditors, if they were of the Church of England, could heare him with patience, to cast all their Ancestors to hell; a Blasphemy so opposit to the Doctrin of their Church; wherein doth the Charity of the Protestant Church consist, and they do vaunt that they exceed the Catholicks? is it in saying that by *ignorance* a Papist may be saued in his Religion, prouided his lyfe be good? this is no excess of Charity, for wee grant also (as wee will declare in the ensueing Chap.) that Protestants, and not only they, but Heathens and Iews may be saued in their Religion, if they be igno-

rant, and liue well. wee are but little beholding to the Proteſtant charity, if they grant no greater capacity of ſaluation in the Roman Catholick Religion, then in Paganiſm and Iudaiſm. No S^r ſince you are reſolued to be a Proteſtant let me teach you their Doctrin; its thus: they ſay wee are guilty of errours, that their Tenets of *figuratiue Preſence, No Purgatory &c.* are vndeniable plain conſequences out of Scripture, and therefore wee err in denying them: and that wee do err blamably and willfully, becauſe they are plain vndubitable conſequences out of Scripture; (as you ſay alſo Mr Sall (and wheras wee haue the ſcripture, and beliue it to be the word of God, and haue wits to vnderſtand, and ſufficient inſtruction, wee cannot but be willfully ignorant, which ignorance is not ſufficient to excuſe vs from blame for not belieuing: but they ſay, that our denying of them articles, though wee be obſtinat in our denyal, will not damn vs, (if wee haue no other ſin) becauſe they are not fundamental Articles of Faith; our errours do not shock the eſſential parts of religion, though it were better and more ſafe to belieue them, yet their belief is not abſolutly requiſit for ſaluation. This is the

Doctrin of the Church of England; they grant vs ſaluation, not for any ignorance, but becauſe wee hold the *ſubſtance* and all *eſſential* points of Faith.

Its therefore that Bramhal, Bishop of Armagh, called the Articles wherin the Proteſtant diſſent from the Catholick Church, *Pious opinions*, and concluded that both Churchs had true Faith, its therefore that Doctor Stillingfleet compares both Churchs, the Catholick to a *Leaky ship*, wherin a man may be ſaued, but with great danger and difficulty; and the Proteſtant to a *ſound ship*, wherin one may be ſaued without hazard. Its therfore that King I ames in the meeting of the Proteſtant Clergy at Southampton pronounced this ſentence; *vvee deteſt in this point the cruelty of the Puritans, and iudge them deſeruing of fire, vvho affirm that in the Popish religion a man may not be ſaued*: reade the Doctors of your Church; Luther c. 6. and c. 4. in Gen. Oſiander in epitom: p. 2. pag. 1073. Melancthon in Conf. Aug. art. 21. printed at *Geneua*, an: 1554. zuinglius in epiſ. dedicat: of his Confeſſion of Faith to *francis* the firſt, king of *france*. Doctor field l. 3. de Eccl. c. 9. Bunnie in tract. de pacif: ſect. 18. whitaker q. 5. c. 3. Hooker l.

de Pol. Eccl. but it were tedious to name all; not any of the Church of England, nor of the Lutherans but confeſs that the Catholick Church, is a ſauing Church, becauſe it has not erred in any *fundamental* points; that wee are of one and the ſame Faith, as to the ſubſtance.

Its true the Rigid Puritans, and the Hugonots of france do ſay, that the Catholick Church did err in *fundamental* points of Faith neceſſary for ſaluation; and that therefore there is no ſaluation in her Communion: and the Hugonots are of this ſentiment, but ſince about the yeare 1634. for before, they conſtantly belieued with the Church of England, that the Catholick Faith was a ſauing Faith; witneſs the anſwer of the Hugonot Diuins to *Henry* the fourth of *france*, who asking if a man could be ſaued in the Roman Religion, they anſwered yea; wher vpon he prudently chooſed that Religion, which in the iudgment of all Parties was a ſauing Religion *Spondanus* ad an 1593. But Mr Sall does not Profeſs to be a Puritan, nor Hugonot; and how come he to vtter ſuch an impious expreſſion?

But I will proue againſt him and his Aſſociats Puritans, and Hugonots, that

there is ſaluation in our Religion, euen in their own Principles: for either the true Church can err in *fundamental* points, deſtructiue of ſaluation, or not; if not, then the Roman Church, which in the confeſſion of you all, was the true Church, before, and in Luthers age, did not err in any point of doctrin repugnant to ſaluation; if it can, then your Church, though it should be, as you pretend, the true Church can err alſo in *fundamental* points: and you conſequently, cannot know if you be in the way of ſaluation. Secondly you confeſs that the Lutherans and Proteſtants are in a true way of ſaluation; but if the errours of the Catholik Church were *fundamental* and *damnable*; They could not be in a ſure way of ſaluation; for it is as damnable an errour, to ſay that a man may be ſaued in the profeſſion of damnable errours; as to profeſs them: for example its as damnable an errour to ſay, that a man may be ſaued denying Ieſus Chriſt, as it is to deny him; *væ qui dicitis bonum malum*; if the Catholicks therefore be in a damnable ſtate for profeſſing thoſe, which you call errours; the Proteſtants and Lutherans; who vnanimously ſay, they can be ſaued in the actual profeſſion of thoſe

errours, muſt be in a damnable ſtate. You muſt then either abſolue both, or condemn both: beſids, the Lutherans hold ſome Points with the Catholicks, which you condemn as damnable errors in our Religion, for example, the *Real Preſence* of Chriſts Body in the *Euchariſt*; yet you beleiue the Lutherans may be ſaued in their Religion; therefore you muſt grant ſaluation to the Catholicks.

And now let vs draw Mr Sall by the skirt, and mind him of what he ſayes pag. 24. The Arch. B. of Cashel his inſtructor, diſcourſed with him, and *his modeſty* (pag. 28.) *added great vveight to his reaſons*; Poore foul; how ſimply you were fooled out of your Religion, as appears by this paſſage: His Lordship acknow-ledged *the Catholick Church vvas a part of the true Church*: (*but not the vvhole*) and Mr Sall fancyed to perceiue *ſuch an admirable charity and real deſire of vnion among Chriſtians, in this noble acknovvledgment of his Grace, in* granting vs that *Honorable Title*, that he preſently yielded all reſpect and ſubmiſſion to his reaſons. Open your eyes, Poore Man, you are charm'd by your inſtructors modeſty, and cheated of your Religion by fayre words. *Honorable title?*

wherin doth the *Honor* of that Title of *Catholick* consist, if it does not signify a Profession leading to saluation? is it because that wee believe many articles of Christianity, though wee deny some? then the Title of *Arrian* and *Pelagians* is *Honorable*; which Professions believed diuers Tenets of Christianity. Is it because that by *ignorance* wee may be excused and be saued? but you say, that only the *simple sort* can haue that ignorance; and besids, Iews and Pagans may be saued in their respective Professions, if they can claym ignorance. Thus that *Honorable title*, which sounded so pleasant to your ears is but an empty voyce.

His Instructor granted the Church of Rome to be a part of the Catholick Church, but not the whole; and M. Sall did see *such a vein of Charity and Zeale to run through these words* that he was rauish'd. was euer, Poore soule so deluded. why did not you ask, what his Lordp meant by *Roman Church*, if he meant the *Dioces of Rome*; that indeed is a part of the Catholick Church, but that is not the Church wee speake of; that wee say, is *infallible*; and wherof *wee are Members*, (for wee are no Members of that Church) wherin wee say, *man*

muſt be ſaued if in any: but if his Lordp did ſpeake to the purpoſe, and to what wee belieue; by the Roman Catholick Church, as I declared 5. ch. and in the entrance to this chap. wee vnderſtand all Chriſtians throughout the world vnited in Faith and Communion with the Church of Rome; which is the chiefe and *Mother* Church: if he ſayes, This is but a part of the Church of God; where is the other part? I ſay where was it when Luther began his pretended Reformation? for then there was no viſible Congregation of Chriſtians (at leaſt No Proteſtants nor any thing lyke them) that did adminiſter Sacraments and preach the word of God, but was vnited in Faith and Communion with the Roman Church; only ſuch as were then held by Luther, and now by vs ſchiſmatick as you are: which then, was the other part of Chriſt's true Church? but this is not all; how could he ſay, and you belieue, that the Roman Church, (take it either for the Dioces of Rome, or as wee vnderſtand it,) is a part of the Catholick Church, if it be guilty of damnable errors? can that be the true Church, or any part of it, that profeſſes damnable errors againſt Faith? S. Athanaſius his Creed ſayes, no: for it: requi-

tes to haue an entyre and inuiolable Faith: and you that is a Profeſſor of Diuinity, will ſay, that a particular Perſon who holds damnable errors againſt the doctrin of the Church and obſtinatly adheres to them, is an heretick, and no member of hers: conſequently you muſt ſay, (and your Inſtructor deluded you in ſaying the contrary) that the Roman Church can be not part of the true Church, if in her there was no ſaluation through damnable errors in doctrin.

You ſee Mr Sall that againſt the doctrin of the Church of England, againſt your own and your Inſtructors conceſſions, you haue engaged in that blaſphemous aſſertion of not ſaluation in the Catholick Church, to vſe your own expreſſion, pag. 75. *to ſpight the Catholick you ran beyond all meaſure, euen of your owvn principles; as to ſpight the Iewv, and ſeem a good Chriſtian, one vvould eat more Pork, than his ſtomak can beare.* And to get the credit of a ſound and zealous Proteſtant among your new Brethren, you haue exceeded them in decrying the Church.

But the Reader will vnderſtand by what I haue diſcourſed in this Chapter, that the Catholick Church is *the* true Church; that ſhe cannot err in any point whatsoeuer of Re-

ligion, and consequently, that saluation is to be sought in her.

VIII. CHAPT.

THAT THE PROTESTANT CHVRCH is not the Church of Christ, nor any part of it: That they cannot vvithout blasphemy alleadge Scripture for their Tenets: That they haue not one, and the same Faith vvith Catholicks: that out of the Catholick Church there is no saluation. Hovv far can ignorance excuse Protestants.

IT is the constant doctrin of the Protestant Church (for I call not the *Puritans* and *Hugonots* of France, Protestants, whose error in this point I haue shewen in the former chap.) that the Catholick Church has not erred in *fundamental* points of Religion; becausse the true Church, (such as the Catholick was before Luther confessedly, and now is, in their acknowledgment) cannot err in *essential* and *fundamental* articles, consequently they discourse, that the Protestant and Catholick Church, differ only in points not *fundamental*, and inferior truths, which, say

they, are pernicious errors, but break not Vnity of Faith, nor destroyes not saluation. That the true Church can err, and is fallible in points *not fundamental* and *inferior truths*. This is faithfully the doctrin of the Protestant Church, as you will find in the Authors I quoted in the former Chapt. in Stilling fleet in his book miscalled a *Rational Account* and in seueral others cited in the Protestant Apology, tr. 1. c. 6. and tract. 2. c. 2.

Now wee must consider, what is the Protestant Church properly; it belieues many Articles (and as they say all *fundamental* Articles) that the Catholick belieues: so far they are not Properly Protestants, but their proper Notion is to be taken from those Tenets, wherin they differ: so that *Protestancy* properly, and as it is condistinct from *Catholecism*, or *Popery*, as you say; is the doctrin wherin the Protestant Church differs from the Catholick. Now I proue that the Protestant Church, as it is properly the Protestant Church, condistinct from the Catholick, is not the Church of Christ; becausе it does not teach the doctrin of Christ; and no Church can be called of Christ further that it teacheth his doctrin; and doubteless if wee did ask the

Proteſtants and firſt Reformers, why they did ſeparate from the Catholick Church, they would ſay. *To believe and practiſe the Doctrin of Chriſt, which the Catholick denyed.* But I will proue that their doctrin, for which they ſeparated from vs, and wherin they differ from vs, is not the Doctrin of Chriſt.

The argument is in *Ferio*, thus: *No fallible doctrin is the doctrin of Chriſt.* For who would be ſo blaſphemous, as to ſay, that what Chriſt has taught is fallible Doctrin: *But Proteſtancy* (thats to ſay all the Doctrin wherin Proteſtants differr from Catholicks and for which they ſeparated from vs) *is altogether fallible Doctrin; therefore Proteſtancy, as it is properly the Doctrin of the Proteſtant Church, is not the Doctrin of Chriſt*: That *Proteſtancy*, or the Doctrin wherin wee differ, is all fallible Doctrin, its manifeſt; for *Proteſtancy*, or Doctrin wherin wee differ, is altogether of points not *fundamental*; wee all agree in the *fundamental* Articles, as they vnanimously confeſs; wee only differ in *inferiour Truths*, wherin the Catholick Church has erred. But the doctrin of points not *fundamental* and *inferior truths* is fallible Doctrin; for its their conſtant Doctrin alſo, that the true Church, be it the Catholick or Prote-

ſtant, can err and is fallible in articles not *fundamental*, and *inferiour truths*: therefore all your *Proteſtancy* is but fallible doctrin; therefore its not the doctrin of Chriſt. I confeſs ingenuously, I think this argument cannot be ſolidly anſwered.

For is it not certain, that you differ from vs, as you ſay, only in *not fundamental* articles? is it not alſo your doctrin, that the true Church is fallible in articles not *fundamental*; how can it then be denyed, but; that you differ from vs only in fallible doctrin; the doctrin wherin you differ from vs is Proteſtancy, and nothing els is properly Proteſtãcy, but that for which you departed from vs: therfore your Proteſtancy is but fallible doctrin, and conſequently not the doctrin of Chriſt.

Hence I infer that you cannot without Blaſphemy looke for your doctrin in Scripture; no text or word of God can be alleadged for Proteſtancy; nor any other warrant but your meer fancy: for your proteſtancy is but a parcell of fallible doctrin, and no fallible doctrin can without Blaſphemy be ſought for in Scripture, which contains nothing but Gods infallible word. Obſerue how vainly the Proteſtants do boaſt their Religion, and differẽce from vs to be

bottom'd on the word of God; that their figuratiue Preſence, is cleer in the Scripture that they will proue the pretended errors for which they forſook vs, by Scripture: they amuſe the poore People with the ſpecious pretext of Scripture; no Rule of Faith but Scripture; no Iudge of Controuerſy, but Scripture; no warrant for Diuin worſhip, but Scripture, and after all, its manifeſt by my former diſcourſe, that no Article of Proteſtancy, as it is a particular Doctrin diſtinct from Catholeciſm, can without ſacrilege be sought for in Scripture.

If the Proteſtant Church be not *The* Church of Chriſt, it can be no part of it, for the ſame reaſon which, but now, I propoſed, for that no Article of Proteſtancy is the Doctrin of Chriſt, being all but fallible Doctrin; if they will not pretend to be a part of the Church becauſe they belieue the *chief* and *fundamental* Articles, wherin they agree with vs; and thats ridiculous, becauſe, in ſo much they are not Proteſtants; its not for them Articles that they departed from vs, and ſet vp a diſtinct Church, this is to be a part of the Church in as much as they can pretend to be of the Roman Catholick Church: and if they might be called a part of the Church for

for that reaſon ; Pelagians , Eutychians, and other Heretick Congregations may be called ſo alſo , and thus the Church of Chriſt inſteed of being the Houſe of Peace and vnion, be a houſe of confuſion.

Out of this diſcourſe alſo wee may vnderſtand, how vain is the pretence of Proteſtants and ſeueral other ſects, to vnity of Faith with the Roman Catholicks; for when wee vrge them with this argument; There is but *One Faith*, as there is *but one God* S. Paul Eph: 4. without that *one Faith*, *its impoſsible to pleaſe God* ; the Catholick Church has that Faith, for you ackowledg its a true and a ſauing Faith, that holds all Articles neceſſary for ſaluation; if therefore there be but one ſauing Faith, no other will ſaue but the Roman Catholick Faith: they are ſo grauel'd with this diſcourſe that they are glad to claim kinred with vs, and ſay that wee all , *Catholicks* , *Lutherans Preſbiterians* and *Proteſtants*, haue but one and the ſame Faith , as to the *ſubſtance* and *Eſſentials* of Faith; becauſe wee all beleiue the Prime and chief Articles of Chriſtianity, Chriſts Incarnation, Paſſion, &c. which with a good moral lyfe is ſufficient for ſaluation; nor is it poſſible that God will condemn a man that beleiues thoſe Articles,

and liues a good lyfe, for denying Purgatory, a tryfle nothing material if there be any or not. This *Omnifidian* Doctrin of the *Latitudinarians* is now in great vogue, and cryed vp for a charitable Doctrin that excludes none from ſaluation, but lycenceth you to change Religions as your Intereſt or conuemency requires.

Out of this Principle follows, that if they haue not the ſame Faith with the Roman Catholicks, they haue not a ſauing Faith; otherwyſe there would be two ſauing Faiths: But they are not of the ſame Faith, nay they are of a far different; for its not enough for *vnity* of Faith with the Catholicks, to believe the *Prime fundamental* Articles; but all and euery particular Article, though inconſiderable it may ſeeme to you, which the Catholick Church propoſes to be a reuealed truth: any one Article that you deny, though ſmale it be, for example *Purgatory*, breaks *vnity* of Faith with the Roman Catholick Church.

The Church believes the Real preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, and believes the Lawfullneſs of Marriage; and the lawfullneſs of eating any victuals. You cannot iuſtly ſay, that one of theſe Articles is more. *Fundamental* than the other:

why should the Lawfullneſs of Marriage be a *Fundamental* point of Religion, more than the *real Preſence*? by your ſence of *Fundamental* and *not fundamental* Articles, they are of a ſeyſe. And what think you? would he that agreeth in all other Articles and deny only the Lawfullneſs of Marriage, would he, I ſay, haue *vnity* of *Faith* with the Catholick Church? by your rule he would, becauſe he agrees in all *fundamental*, and *Prime* points; he only differs in an inferior truth, a ſmale matter. Yet S. Paul expresly ſayes that he would not: 1. Tim. 4. 3. *in the lather dayes certain vvill depart from the Faith* (obſerue the word *depart*) *attending to the Spirit of errors and Doctrin of Deuils, for bidding to Marry and abſtain from meats.* Doth not this proue that the denyal of ſmale Articles breaks *vnity* of Faith? you cannot therefore pretend to haue the ſame Faith with the Roman Catholicks, that deny many Articles of their Faith.

Secondly the reſurrection of the flesh is indeed a *fundamental* Article, contained in the Apoſtles Creed; but if it be to come at the end of the world, or already paſt, to ſuch as are dead; each ſoule after mans death reaſſuming again his body in

a short tyme ; as *Hymenæus* and *Philetus* ſaid, its no *fundamental* Article, as you Proteſtants vnderſtand *fundamentals*, for the chief and prime Articles: yet S. Paul ſayes of theſe two 2. Tim. 2. 18. *their ſpeech ſpreadeth lyke Canker, of vvhom is Hymenæus and Philetus vvho haue erred from the truth, ſaying that the Reſurrection is paſt, and haue ſubuerted the Faith of ſome.* Behold the denyal of ſmale and inferiour truths, is called by S. Paul, a *ſpreading canker, an erring from the truth*, a *ſubuerſion of the Faith*; it breaks therefore vnity of Faith ; and hence conclude, that you haue not vnity of Faith with the Roman Church, though you belieue with her the Trinity, Incarnation and other chief Articles, becauſe you deny māny others, vnder the pretence of being ſmale and inferour Truths : and deceiue not your ſelf with that diſtinction of fundamental and not fundamental Articles, wher with your Leaders do amuſe you. No article whateuer is man obliged to belieue, if it be not ſufficiently propoſed to him that God has reuealed it : and any article whateuer, which is ſufficiently propoſed vnto vs, to haue been reuealed by God ; wee are obliged vnder pain of damnation to belieue : it

ſo that as to our obligation of belieuing, all Articles are equally fundamental, if they be ſufficiently propoſed. Its true ſom Myſteries of Faith are of their own Nature more requiſit, and needfull, and on that account may be called *fundamental*, as the Myſtery of the Trinity, and Chriſt his Incarnation; but that is nothing to our purpoſe, what obliges me to belieue them, is not that they are ſo abſolutly or greatly needfull, for no ſuch abſolut nor great neceſſity of Chriſt his *death* can be proued, he could haue redeemed vs with one tear he shed; yet it is a *fundamental* Article, becauſe it is ſufficiently propoſed to me, to be a truth reuealed: ſo that in order to my obligation of belieuing, all Articles ſufficiently propoſed, as reuealed truths, are equally fundamental: And ſince that wee own our obligation of belieuing the Scripture to be Scripture, Trinity and Incarnation, vpon the teſtimony of the Church which ſayes they are reuealed Truths, ſince the ſame Church declares that Purgatory alſo is a reuealed Truth, I am as much obliged to belieue it, as the Trinity and Incarnation, though the Myſteries in them ſelues, be of an infinit inequality.

By this its proued that without the en-

tyre belief of all and euery Article believed by the Church of Rome, you haue not one and the ſame Faith with her; if you haue not her Faith, you haue not the true ſauing Faith; for hers is ſuch, and there is, but *One*: if you haue not a true ſauing Faith, you cannot be ſaued: therefore out of the Church of Rome there is no ſaluation. Blame me not for this Aſſertion; blame S. Paul who ſaies there is no ſaluation without Faith, and ſaies there is but one Faith, which wee haue proued, and you confeſs to be our Faith: blame S. Auguſtin epiſt. 152. *Whoeuer is, or ſhall be ſeparated from the Catholick Church, although he thinks himſelf to liue moſt laudibly, for this one wickedneſs, that he is disioyned from the vnity of Chriſt, ſhall haue no lyfe, but the wrath of God remayns on him*; blame the Fathers of all ages, who vnanimously agree in this; that out of the true Church there is no ſaluation. By what I haue diſcourſed in the firſt chap. it is euident there is but one Church: by what I haue diſcourſed in the progreſs of this Treatiſe and eſpecially in theſe two laſt chap. I proued that this one true Church is the Roman Catholick Church. Its conſequent therefore that out of her Faith and communion is no ſaluation.

Neither can wee be iuſtly accuſed of want of charity for holding this Tenet: by your acknowledgment (I mean the Proteſtants and Lutherans) the Catholick Religion is a ſauing Religion: but no Religion is a ſauing Religion, that is not charitable, witneſs S. Paul 1. Cor. 13. 2. *If I should haue Faith, ſo as to moue mountains, and haue no Charity, I am nothing.* Therefore you cannot ſay, but our Faith is a charitable Faith.

Anſwer me to this argument; God has commanded vnder the dreadfull punishment of being blotted out of the book of lyfe, to add nothing to, or diminish any thing from his word: Reuel 22. 19. and Deut. 4. 2. Either wee Catholicks do add to the ſubſtance and eſſentials of the Faith of Chriſt, by belieuing *real Preſence*, and *Purgatory* to be *fundamental* points of Religion reuealed by God, or you Proteſtants do diminish from the ſubſtance and eſſence of his Faith by denying thoſe points, and ſaying they are not ſubſtantial and eſſential points of Religion: either then, wee Catholicks muſt be blotted out of the Book of lyfe, becauſe wee belieue too much, and impoſe vpon the flock a larger belief than Chriſt has; or you Proteſtants muſt be blot-

ted out of that book, becauſe you take away ſome *fundamental* points which Chriſt has reuealed: it is therefore impoſſible that in both Religions a man be ſaued. Either wee are not a ſauing Religion, becauſe wee add *fundamental* points; or you are not, becauſe you take them away. But by your acknowledgment, and by what wee haue proued wee are in a ſauing Religion; therefore you muſt confeſs that you are not.

Now wee muſt examin if ignorance can excuſe the Proteſtants, they pretend that they do not know they are in an error; ad heer wee will anſwer to what Mr Sall auers, that all Catholick Doctors confeſs, that a Proteſtant baptized, belieuing the Common Principles of Chriſtianity, not conuinced of error againſt Faith, but conceiuing he follows the truth; is not an Heretick, but a member, of the Catholick Church; and ſo liuing a good lyfe may be ſaued; for which he cites our Catholick Diuins.

It is the conſtant Doctrin of our ſchools, that an inuincible ignorance of the Truth excuſeth from the profeſſion of it: and ſaying that it is the conſtant Doctrin, I need not cite Authors for it. An inuinci-

ble ignorance, is when you haue no means, nor cannot get, after a diligent enquiry, any means, for to ouercome it, and be informed of the Truth. The ſecond poſition aſſented alſo vnto by our ſchools, that a vincible, ſupin, or groſs ignorance doth not excuſe you, from profeſſing the Truth: and this kind of ignorance you are in, when you haue means afforded to you, for to inſtruct you, and through careleſneſs or ſome other motiue, you do not make vſe of thoſe means: or if you haue not thoſe means at hand; you may, if you enquire for them get them and be inſtructed; and in ſo weighty a matter as Chriſtian Faith wherof depends your ſaluation; did you know that in Conſtantinople you could find them, you ought, ſetting all other conſiderations aſyde, to go thither to ſeek them. Now wee all grant, that a Proteſtant who is inuincibly ignorant, that has no way, nor after due enquiry, can get no means to ouercom his ignorance, and be ſufficiently informed of the truth of the Catholick Tenet; ſuch a man Baptized, belieuing the common Principles of Chriſtianity; and liuing a good lyfe will be ſaued: but this is ſmale comfort, for of the Iews and Pagans wee muſt ſay the lyke.

Secondly a Proteſtant (and there are I feare, many of this ſort) that would amuſe himſelf with the perſwaſion of being in an inuincible ignorance, and that his Tenets will not condemn him, becauſe, if in effect they should be falſe he is ignorant of that, and his ignorance, which he perſwads himſelf to be inuincible, will excuſe him, and will not be curious to enquire any more; this man, I auerr is in ſtate of damnation; for its a damnable ſin to expoſe himſelf to a manifeſt danger of profeſſing a damnable error, but this man who perſwades himſelf that he is *inuincibly* ignorant, and ſooths himſelf with that perſwaſion, and ſo reſteth content, expoſeth himſelf manifeſtly to the danger of holding a damnable error: for what he has to ſecure him, is only an *inuincible* ignorance, and what if that ignorance be not truly *inuincible*? what if he be not certain, that his ignorance is *inuincible*? then it cannot excuſe him: therefore wheras he does not certainly know that his ignorance is *inuincible*, he expoſes himſelf to manifeſt danger of profeſſing a damnable error.

But howeuer the Principle taken in itſelf is true; that if a Proteſtant be *inuincibly* ignorant, it excuſes him. And wheras no

man can certainly know that the ignorance of a Proteſtant it not inuincible; (only God can know that) certainly it is rashneſs in any man to ſay; *this man that dyed in the Proteſtant Religion is damned.* For *inuincible* ignorance is a matter of fact; it depends, of, that the truth was not ſufficiently propoſed; that the means apointed by God for our inſtruction were not had, or could not be had; and how can you know certainly, that all Proteſtants haue the truth ſufficiently propoſed to them or that they haue, or can haue the ſufficient means to be inſtructed in the truth; nay or to doubt in the leaſt of their own Profeſſion: for example a yong Lad that neuer left his Fathers houſe; neuer heard of Catholick Religion but all to deſaduantage; has no Catholick to confer, with, or if any, not ſuch as can giue him ſatisfaction; he is through ſickneſs or other impediments vnable to go in ſearch of Prieſts, or learned men; he liues in his own Profeſſion well: can you be ſure that this Lads ignorance was not inuincible? for my part, I iudge there are ſom though but few I feare, that haue an inuincible ignorance. I ſay but few, for the reaſon I will produce ſoon. But of learned men and men vers'd in the tranſa-

ations of ages, wee may haue moral assurance, that their ignorance cannot be inuincible; and of them we may say, that if God has not giuen them som inward light in the last gasp, and an act of contrition, (which yet to vs is vnknowen) but that they dyed in the belief of their Tenets they are damn'd.

The reason why I say, that but few Protestants can haue an inuincible ignorance of our Catholick Doctrin, is; All men are perswaded that there is a true Church, and there is nothing more euident to any man of common sense, than that all those Congregations, and each of them which wee see among vs of *Quakers, Presbyterians Anabaptists, Protestants, Catholiks*, are not the true Church, this I say is apparent to any man of common sense; because each of vs condemns not only the external gouernement, but the Tenets of the other; and though all the rest ioyns to oppose the Catholick, yet take them seperatly, they are as apposit against one an other, as they are against vs. In this confusion there is a very easy way to find out which of all is the true Chutch; for what is more easy for a man that reflects seriously vpon the concerns of Religion, (which euery man

is obliged in conſcience to do) than to learn by the Chronicles of England, and by the ſeueral Hiſtoryes that are written, when did theſe that wee call *Reformations* begin; on what occaſion, and where in the world was there any ſuch thing as *Proteſtant* Church, *Presbyterian* Church &c. two hundred ~~and four~~ years agon. There is not a child in the Parish hardly, but knows that Luther and Caluin began the Reformation which now is called *Proteſtant*, *Presbyterian* &c. in oppoſition to Popery, which was, as they pretended full of errors; then Maſs was banished, Biſhops, Monks and Prieſts were exiled, and their Lands forfeited, the Churches were taken from vs; and the Reformation introduced. I know the Proteſtant will reply thath his Religion is *Apoſtolical*, that it was the very Religion which Chriſt eſtabliſhed and the Apoſtles preached, but this conſideration is too heigh for men of common vnderſtanding, this point cannot be ſoon cleered; therefore I will not now engage in it, becauſe I pretend to shew to men of common vnderſtanding an eaſy way to find out, if this or that be a true Church. whether your Religion was in the Apoſtles tyme or no; you cannot de-

ny, but that which you call the *Reformation*, is but of leſs than two hundred years date. The ruins of the Churchs and Abbyes, the Church Lands, the Croſſes placed in the heigh way, and ſeueral other marks yet extant of Popery do teſtify it was the Catholick Religion, that was the Religion of the Land, your Chronicles beare witneſs, it was it that florished for ſo many ages before, in it your Anceſtors did liue and dye. This no man but knows.

This ſuppoſed; there is no man of common ſenſe (if he reflects on the affairs of his ſaluation, which reflexion wee are all obliged to make) but is obliged to doubt of this Reformation, or any branch of it be the true Religion; you ſay men of common ſenſe, and of good vnderſtanding do not doubt of it, notwithſtanding all what wee haue premiſſed; but I ſay that they are obliged in conſcience to doubt of it, if they do not its through a ſupin and groſs negligence of their ſaluation, which is culpable and damnable. I ſay they are bound in conſcience to doubt of it: firſt becauſe common ſenſe, if not byaſs'd by ſom preiudice, does dictat to any man, that nouelties and innouations in matters of Religion are to be ſuſpected, and this

pretended Reformation is ſuch, that was vnknowen to the world the day that Luther began it, and to all the precedent ages; for neuer was there any ſuch thing as Proteſtancy ſpoken of. Secondly becauſe common ſenſe dictats to a man that an ancient Religion, which florished, and which, and noe other was eſtablished in all Chriſtiandom ought not to be reuerſed by a priuat Man as Luther was, without sheuvingby Miracles and ſupernatural ſigns, that he was commiſſioned by God for ſo great a work; and wheras Luther did shew no ſuch (no Proteſtant dare ſay that euer he did) the truth of his Reformation ought to be doubted of. Thirdly that very Catholick Church which he oppoſed, was in former ages often oppoſed by others, and she ſtill remayned victorious, and her oppoſers condemned for Hereticks, which to any rational man is a ſufficient ground for to doubt, that Luther alſo might be ſuch as the other oppoſers were.

And if you ſay, that you ought not to doubt becauſe your Anceſtors haue ſufficiently examined the cauſes of that Reformation, and found them to be iuſt; and that you receiue the Faith you profeſs from them; and that you rely on their word: I anſwer, for one Anceſtor of yours who

approued the Reformation; a hundred of your Anceſtors approued the old Catholick Religion, without any ſuch Reformation. And were there no other cauſe for any man of common ſenſe for to doubt of the truth of the Reformation, than that the very Reformers and their reſpectiue ſucceſſors are deuided among themſelues, ſome of them approuing in the Catholick Church for good Doctrin, what others condemn for an error; this very diſſention ought to make the Reformation ſuſpected. For Caluin and his Diſciple, which are the Church of England (in ſo much) condemns the *Real Preſence* of Chriſt his Body in the *Euchariſt*; Luther and his Diſciples do firmly belieue the *Real Preſence*; Luther condemns the Catholick Church for belieuing S. Pauls Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and ſome other parts of Scripture, to be Canonical: Caluin, with the Church of England ſays the Catholicks do well, and they alſo belieue them to be Canonical. Seueral other examples wee could bring of Doctrins that ſome of the Reformers condemn for errors in the Catholick Church, and other Reformers ſay they are no ſuch: ought not this to make vs doubt of the truth of this Reformation.

Now

Now that it is apparent, that any man man of common ſenſe who reflects on Religion ought to doubt of this Reformation; the way to ſatisfy his doubt is very eaſy. For if he finds that the Catholick Church does in this age, and in Luthers, and each of the precedent ages work Miracles in confirmation of her Doctrin; and that the Reformation, nor any branch of it, has none; can any reaſonable man deſire a more pregnant proof of the truth of the Catholick Church, and falshood of the Reformation? reade the Hiſtoryes, and Fathers of all ages, you shall find the Miracles wrought by her, as I related in the former Chapter; you ſay you find them related, but you do not belieue them: this I call, and cannot be called otherwyſe than obſtinacy; to deny what the whole Torrent of Antiquity affirms, as it would be obſtinacy to deny there was a Iulius Cæſar in the world, for which wee haue but the teſtimony of Hiſtoryes written by Pagans, for no Chriſtian did ſee him. You ſay the Authors that relate thoſe Miracles were Papiſts and therefore their teſtimony to be ſuſpected. I anſwer the Authors who write thoſe Miracles had no pike againſt Proteſtants, nor did not write out

of any deſign againſt you, for you were not in the world, and therefore, you ought not to pretend any exception againſt them: and if but one or two did relate them, your reflexion could be pardonable; but to ſay that all the Fathers and Hiſtorians of Antiquity, were knaues that ſpoke againſt their conſciences (many relating them to haue been wrought in their own preſence) or fools that did not vnderſtand what miracles were; is an intolerable impudence.

Add to the Miracles wrought by this Church in all ages, the conuerſion of Nations to Chriſtianity, (and none by the Reformation) the ſucceſſion of her Bishops without interruption for ſo many ages; (no ſuch in the Reformation) Her Eminent Saints, (none in the Reformation) her vnion in Doctrin of Faith; (none in the Reformation) the voluntary pouerty of her Profeſſors, exchanging plentifull eſtates for the powerty of a religious lyfe (a practiſe recommended by Chriſt, and thought madneſs by the Reformation) the multitude of Churchs built by her, and demolished by the Reformation. Does not all this proue our Church to be the true Church of Chriſt, that he has qualified with ſuch

glorious Marks? Theſe makes our Church ſo glorious, and shyne lyke the Citty on the Mountain, lyke the candle in the candleſtick, that it is hardly poſſible that any man can haue an inuincible ignorance of her being the true Church; and *VVo* be to the man, that relying on the perſwaſion of the inuincibility of his ignorance (which in effect is but obſtinacy) will liue out of her.

I conclude with that Paper, that Mr Sall ſpeakes of, wherin he deliuered that a Proteſtant, believing the common Principles of Chriſtianity, and lieuing acording the rules of his profeſſion, being inuincibly ignorant might be ſaued; for which doctrin he complains to haue been cenſured; and cryes *Victory*, becauſe that none of our Clergy did anſwer, though they did cenſure him. He misinforms his Readers; it was not that doctrin which was cenſured, and if his Paper did contain no more than it; it required no anſwer; it was his indiſcretion was cenſured: and I will be iudged by you, Reader, if he was not indiſcreet in this point: for if a Preacher were ſent to conuert Pagans to Chriſtianity, would it be diſcretion in him to teach them, Srs *the Chriſtian Religion is the beſt, but you may be*

very vvell ſaued in that vvhich you hold, if you be inuincibly ignorant. The doctrin is very true, but a man that goes to conuert them, to Chriſtianity from a Religion that he knows is in itſelf falſe, ought not to encourage them to remayn in that Religion, with the hopes of being ſauedin it: his obligation is to beat them out of their ignorance, and not to propoſe it vnto them, as a *Medium* of ſaluation: would not they anſwer him well; if wee can be ſaued through our ignorance in the Religion wee haue; why do you diſturb vs with any other, and creat ſcruples in our minds? This is Mr Salls caſe that was ſent to Ireland to conuert Proteſtants who thought themſelues perhaps to be inuincibly ignorant: iudge you was it diſcretion to propoſe vnto them their inuincible ignorance as an encouragement to remayn in their errors. Its not allwayes diſcretion to declare the truth itſelf (when there is no obligation of declaring it, as in this there could be none: for the Nobility, which, he ſayes, propoſed him that queſtion, were they Catholiks or Proteſtants? if Catholicks its manifeſt, they needed not to be inſtructed in that truth; its no fundamental point of Religion. If Proteſtants, they were not

obliged to know it, for the ſame reaſon: and, that the anſwer was an encouragment to them to remayn as they were, and ſeek no inſtruction; and wheras they made that queſtion it ſeems they doubted if inuincible ignorance was ſufficient; and if that anſwer had not been giuen; lykely the would ſecure their ſaluation by ſeeking inſtruction. This is the indiſcretion, for which he was cenſured. Now wee will deſcend to the errors which he fixs on the Church of Rome.

THE SECOND PART,

OF THE PRETENDED ERRORS of the Roman Church, alleadged by Mr Sall.

HAuing in the former part shewen the Neceſſity of an Infallible liuing Iudge; and that to be the Roman Catholick Church; there needed no other anſwer to any doubt in Religion, though intricat and vnanſwerable it might ſeem to vs; but to ſay, *the Church vvhich is infallible and Gods Oracle teacheth it: therefore it muſt be true, though I do not vnderſtand hovv.* But becauſe our Aduerſary confides much in the ſtrength of his arguments, wee will deſcend to examin each point in particular, which he impugns; and it will appeare, that though wee had not the teſtimony of an infallible Church, to rely vpon; but only Reaſon, and Scripture as interpreted by Ancient Fathers; our cauſe is better grounded, than theirs, and if not *better*, at leaſt as well: which if it

appears; then none, but will condemn them for forſaking an old Religion, and ſeeking to reuers it by a pretended Reformation, when they can shew no better grounds for their Nouelties, than wee haue for our Ancient doctrin.

POP'S INFALLIBILITY, AND THE Reſolution of Faith expounded.

HE forſakes the Catholick Church for her errors, and which be they? the firſt, is the Popes infallibility: if this be an error, its not of the Church, for as I haue shewen ch. 5. its no Article of Faith that the Pope is infallible; if he mislyked that doctrin, he might haue denied it, and remain a Catholick. I can not well perceiue what he thinks of the Church vniuerſal; whether he believes her infallible or no? for, pag. 34. he grants, that the text of S. Paul Tim. 3. 15. *The Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth.* Muſt be vnderſtood of the vniuerſal Church; but whether he grants, that thence she is proued infallible or no; I cannot vnderſtand: thence he inferrs; that the Roman Church, that is to ſay the Dioces of Rome, is not infallible, nor the

Pillar and ground of Truth: but alas he might haue ſpared himſelf that labor; for wee do not belieue, that the Dioces of Rome is an infallible Church; nor that the Pope is infallible: when wee ſay, the Roman Catholick Church is infallible, wee mean, (and all our Aduerſaries know that) the Church of Rome, and all Churchs vniuerſally ſpread throughout the world, which are vnited with her in Faith and Communion; either as she is diffuſed or repreſentatiue in a General Council: wherin Proteſtants are not included, though a Chriſtian Congregation, becauſe they are deuided from her. This Church is the true vniuerſal Church; called *Roman*, becauſe the chief Paſtor is in Rome; called *Vniuerſal*, becauſe her Members are ſpread throughout the world: of the infallibility of this Church, Mr Sall ſpeaks nothing, but of the Pop's infallibity, which is no Article of Faith; which, if an error, is not of the Church, and therefore ought not to leaue the Church for this reaſon.

When our Aduerſaries are obliged, and do promiſe to proue our errors by plain and vndeniable Scripture, from the pag. 29. to 35. and from pag. 39. to 44. where

Mr Sall vnder takes to proue this error; not one text of Scripture does he alleadge, but three, so far from being plain and vndeniable, that any man of common sense will find them impertinent: the first pſ. 11. 1. *verities are maimed among the children of Men.* And how can this proue the Church to be fallible, if it does not proue, that the Apostles, Euangelists, and Prophets are also fallible, who were Children of Men? and if it does not proue the Church to be fallible also in fundamental points, which Mr Sall and all Protestants deny? The second, *all Men are Lyars, Fallibility*, signifies only a possibility of deliuering an vntruth: a *Lyar* is he that actually deliuers an vntruth, and that against his own knowledge: so that the text, if it proues any thing to Mr Salls purpose; it proues that the Apostles, Euangelists, and the Church of England, are a company of fourbs, that against their mind and knowledg deliuered vntruths; for they are all men; and *all men are lyards.* The third text, is out of S. Io. 16. prouing that the Paraclet was promised to the Church only vpon condition of louing God, and keeping his Commandments; to which I haue giuen a full answer ch. 4. reade there

to saue me and yourself the trouble of a Tatalogy.

Thus Mr Sall has forsaken our Church, and cannot proue by plain Scripture (as he is obliged) her errors. Two reasons he alleadgs, that *infallibility* is an Attribut proper to God; and that there must be no such thing as infallibility of the Church, wheras our Authors do not agree, where to place it; if in the Pope alone, or in the Council: to which reasons I haue sufficiently answered in the beginning of the 3. ch. He sayes, that the text of S. Paul Tim. 3. *the Church is the Pillar and ground of Truth*, must not be vnderstood of the Dioces of Rome: and he knowes well, that wee do not pretend it should; wee pleade for the infallibility of the vniuersal Church, as wee said, but now: He admires that Bellar: should proue the Popes infallibility be the two Hebrew words, signifying *Doctrin* and *Truth*, placed by Gods command, in the breast-plate of the High Priest; and thence drawes a consequence very absurd to him; that the High Priest also must haue been infallible in the old Law. I will not enlarge in this point because, it concerns the Popes infallibility; which is no Articles of Faith (and only such I intend

to vindicat:) but I muſt aduertiſe him of his ignorance, in admiring it should be pretended, that the High Prieſts of the Ancient Law were infallible; wheras (though monſtrous it ſeems to him) not only Catholick but Proteſtant Authors do teach it: one I produce, Doctor Porter a great Clerk in the Proteſtant Church, in his book called Char. Miſt. pag. 35. *The High Prieſts in caſes of moment had a certain Priuiledge from error, if he conſulted the Diuine Oracle, by the iudgment of vrim, or by the breaſt-plate of iudgment vvherin vvere vrim and Thummim; vvhereby he had an abſolut infallible direction.* And immediatly following: *if any ſuch promiſs made by God to aſsiſt the Pope, could be produced, his Deciſon might paſs iuſtly for Oracles vvithout examination.*

This blaſphemy ſayes he, of parallelling *the Pope* with *God in the Attribut of infallibility, is rayſed to a higher degree by their practice, of making the Pope the ſuprem Iudge and Arbiter of Gods Lavvs.* And how does he proue this calumny? *Bellarmin l. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 5. ſticketh not to ſay, that if the Pope did command vices, and prohibit virtues, the Church vvould be obliged to beleiue vice to be good, and virtue bad.* And

the Council of Conſtance commanded the Decrees of Popes to be preferred before the inſtitution of Chriſt; vvheras hauing confeſſed, that our ſauior did ordain the Communion vnder both kinds to the Layty, and that the Apoſtles did practiſe it; they commanded it ſhould be giuen for the future but in one kind, alleading for reaſon that the precedent Popes and Church did practiſe it ſo: vvhich is to extoll the Decrees of Popes aboue them of Chriſt: as if the Lavvs of England, vvere not to be vnderſtood, or practiſed in Ireland, but according to the vvill and declaration of the King of France, certainly the King of France vvould be deemed of more Povver in Ireland, than the King of England, and the People more his ſubiects.

Anſwer: Bellarmin in that place ſpeaks expresly of vices and virtues, when there is a doubt of their being ſuch: as for example, *vſury* is a vice of its nature bad: (*per ſe malum*) now wee all know it to be ſuch; and *reſtitution* to be a virtue: if there should arryſe a doubt of *vſury's* being a vice; and in that caſe the Pope should command *vſury* to be practiſed: then wee should be obliged to practiſe vſury: and *Bellar.* giues the reaſon; *quia tenetur Eccleſia in rebus dubys acquieſcere iudicio ſummi Ponti-*

ficis. Becauſe in dubious caſes the Church is obliged to obey the Pope. Behold how Bellar: ſpeaks in caſe of doubt that vice is vice, and virtue is virtue: for in that caſe the Pope, as being the chief Paſtor, is in poſſeſſion of the obligation of being obeyed by Gods command, and a doubtfull excuſe cannot exempt the ſubiects from their apparent duty. *Melior eſt conditio poſſidentis.*

The Council of Conſtance knew, that though the Communion was inſtituted, and practiſed by the Apoſtles in both kinds; yet Chriſt left it arbitrary to his Church to giue it either in one or both, which I will proue in the diſcourſe of *Half Communion*; and therefore finding that Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles ſomtymes gaue it in one; and that the precedent Popes for iuſt reaſons had commanded it should be receiued ſo; iſſued that Decree of receiuing it in one kind. And it is falſe what you ſay that they alleadged no other reaſon for ſo doing but the Decrees of precedent Popes; they alleadged alſo for reaſon the example of Chriſt and his Apoſtles who gaue it in one kind. Though Chriſt washed his Diſciples feet before he gaue the Communion. Might not the

Council ſay, *Notwithſtanding that Chriſt did waſh the Receiuers feet, yet wee do not require that ceremony?* becauſe that though he did ſo, he did no oblige vs to it: its ſo in this caſe; though in the inſtitution he gaue both kinds; he did not oblige to giue both; and therefore the Council might haue commanded to giue but one: which was not to prefer their Decrees to his inſtitution; but to make vſe of the Power he gaue them. Your example of the King of *France* proues againſt you: for if the King of *France* had the Power and command from him of England, to interpret the Laws; and the *Irish* were commanded by him to vnderſtand and practiſe them, as the King of *France* should interpret them, and not otherwſe; certainly you would not ſay in that caſe, that the King of France woul haue more command and Prower in Ireland, than the King of England; if to flatter his Excellency, you haue not a mind tn ſay, that the Lord Lieutenant has more Prower in Ireland, than the King and ſo bid fayre for a haulter.

Another example to proue wee extoll the Papal Laws aboue the Diuine: *Coſterus*, ſayes he, c. 15. (17. he sould haue ſaid)

prop. 9. doubts not to auerr, that it is a greater ſin in a Prieſt to Marry, which he confeſſes is but a tranſgreſſion of a Papal Law; than to keep a Concubin, which is againſt the Law of God. You belye Coſterus in ſaying that the Marriage of a Prieſt is but a tranſgreſſion of a Papal Law; Though it be but a Papal Law, that any who receiueth Prieſthood, shall make a vow of Chaſtity; yet the vow being once made, its a tranſgreſſion againſt the Diuine Law to violat it: a breach of vow a ſacrilegd, ſayes Coſterus. And this being euident; its no leſs that it is agreater ſin for him to marry; firſt becauſe he shews by marrying that he is an Heretick, believing that to be a marriage, which really is none. Secondly by marrying he teſtifies a ſteddy reſolution of perſeuearing in the ſin.

Canus, ſayes he, and others cited by him, do auer that the Church can err *materially*, and conſequently allows no more infallibility to the Church, than to a priuat Doctor: Anſwer. Canus and other Diuins ſay that the Church an err *materially* in matters of *fact*; as I will declare in the next enſuing Point; but in Points of Doctrin, no Catholick ſayes that the Church can err, nor materially; and Priuat Doctors can

err not only materially but formally. Laſtly he impugns our Doctrin of infallibility with an argument as old as the Reformation: becauſe wee cannot proue it but by Scripture, and wee proue Scripture again by the infaillibility of the Church; and this again by Scripture; and ſo go ſtill round in circle, which is ridiculous in the ſchools: and hence he takes occaſion to pick a quarrel with Becanus; to no other effect, but that his Auditory should vnderſtand that he was acquainted with the works of great Diuins. But I will declare how wee can eaſily expound the Reſolution of our Faith without any Circle; which I am ſure the Proteſtants will neuer do.

An act of Faith, is an Aſſent to a truth which is obſcure and reaſon cannot comprehend (*an argument* of things not appearing ſayes S. Paul) only becauſe it is ſufficiently propoſed to vs, that God reuealed it: and therefore S. Paul calls it a *captiuating of our vnderſtanding*, which is to ſay ſumiſſion of our Reaſon. By *Reſolution of Faith* the Diuins vnderſtand, To declare the *Motiue*, why I believe, or the ground whervpon our Faith doth reſt.

God doth not require of vs to believe ſuddainly that a doctrin is reuealed by him, becauſe

becauſe the Proponent tells vs ſo. S. Peter calls Faith, a *Reaſonable Obſequy*: wee muſt haue ſtrong reaſons to moue vs for to beliеue a Truth to be reuealed before wee giue our Aſſent: therefore, before the Act of Faith (and in human Faith alſo its ſo) wee haue ſom inward diſpoſitions previous to the Aſſent, a good opinion of the Proponent for his lyfe, for his actions and conuerſation, which prepare our vnderſtanding; repreſenting it reaſonable to beliеue what is propoſed. Chriſt himſelf, when he came to preach, did not oblige the Iews to beliеue abruptly, that he was the ſon of God, but began with a Holy lyfe, admirable doctrin, miracles and ſupernatural ſigns, and theſe were previous diſpotions to prepare them, that hauing ſuch ſtrong and credible Motiues, for to iudge him a Perſon aboue the rank of Ordinary men, they ſhould beliеue him, when he ſhould teach them, that he was the ſon of God; wheras it was incredible that God ſhould credit him with ſuch ſupernatural works, and continual marks of his beneuolence, if he were an impoſtor.

This appears in the paſſage of the Blind man cured by Chriſts Io. c. 9. the Scribs and Phariſees ſaid Chriſt was a ſinner; the

Blind Man argued, No; in as much as he worked ſo great a miracle in him: *Niſi hic homo eſſet à Deo, non poterat facere quidquam: if this man were not from God he could do nothing:* all this whyle, he did not beleiue that Chriſt was God; but *a man from God*, extraordinarily fauored by him. He being thus prepared with theſe external Motiues, and iudgment of credibility, wherby he iudged Chriſt to be ſomwhat more than ordinary; Chriſt meets him again, and bids him *beleiue in the ſon of God, yea*, ſaid he, *who is he*: (behold how he was ready, and prepared by that precedent iudgment, for to beleiue) *He that ſpeaks to you, is he*, ſaid Chriſt: and preſently he beleiued: *Credo Domine*. You ſee the Motiue of his Aſſent, was the teſtimony of Chriſt; which he thought, he was bound to beleiue, hauing formerly ſeen his works; which made it euidently credible to him that he muſt ſpeake but truth; wheras they proued him to be a man from God. Thus the People of Samaria, beleiued him to be the ſon of God, when they did heare him; becauſe they were preuiously diſpoſed by the words of the Samaritan, and the miracle, she related of him. Thus the Prophets and Apoſtles proceeded, preparing their Au-

ditory, with the Holyneſs of their lyues, ſecret energy of their doctrin, miracles and ſupernatural ſigns, which moued men to iudge that they were ſent by God; and that they could not be Cheats; and the People, (which is to be obſerued) would be iudged obſtinat, and were iudged obſtinat, ſuch as did not belieue their doctrin, when they did ſee them; or, though they did not ſee them, but were credibly informed by thoſe that did ſee them.

Wee haue in the former part of this Treatiſe shewen the great inducements and Motiues wee haue to iudge that the Roman Catholick Church, beyond all Congregations in the word, is particularly fauored by God; the ſanctity of her doctrin, the conuerſion of Nations by her, vnto a doctrin ſo ſeemingly contrary to reaſon, and irkſom to our natural inclinations; miracles wrought by her in all ages, the conſtancy of her Martyrs, euen in the youngeſt age and weaker ſex. Her vnity in doctrin, againſt the perſecutions of ſo many Tyrants and Hereſiarks that almoſt all ages oppoſed it; theſe marks which are proper only to her; and that no other congregation can claim, makes it euidently credible, that if God ſpeaks to vs by the

mouth of any, it muſt be by hers. The lyke, and no other, had the Primitiue Church, to iudge of the Apoſtles that God ſpoke by them: and ſuch as in the Apoſtles tymes did not belieue them, hauing ſo great inducements to iudge them men of God, were condemned for obſtinat people: and conſequently who will not iudge the ſame of this Church, ought alſo to be held for obſtinat, notwithſtanding any pretence of ignorance they may alleadge.

Hauing theſe inducements to prepare our vnderſtandings for Faith, it follows, that what euer this Church propoſes vnto vs, to be a Truth reuealed by God; wee are obliged to belieue her, and embrace her doctrin vpon her teſtimony; wheras it appears by thoſe inducements ſo credible, that God ſpeaks by her as he did by the Apoſtles.

Now I reſolue my Faith thus: you ask why I belieue the Trinity? I anſwer, becauſe God has reuealed it. You ask why I belieue, that God reuealed it? I anſwer, becauſe the Church, by which God ſpeaks tell vs ſo. You ask, why I belieue, that God ſpeakes by the Church? (heere is the difficulty:) I muſt not anſwer, becauſe the Scripture ſayes it, for I belieue Scripture only vpon

the teſtimony of the infallible Church, and to proue again the infallibility of this, by the Scripture, would be a circle: neither muſt I anſwer, that I belieue God to ſpeake by the Church, becauſe she works miracles, for if the miracles be abſolutly euident, they can be no *Motiue* of Faith, which is of its own nature obſcure: and if they be but morally euident miracles, they cannot be the *Motiue*, becauſe the motiue of Faith muſt be infallible; and becauſe the *Motiue* of an Act of Faith muſt be Gods word, and miracles are not Gods word, but ſigns and Marks of his word. Wee muſt therefore anſwer to that queſtion again, *becauſe the Church by vvhich God ſpeakes, ſaies, that God ſpeakes by her, and I am obliged to belieue he ſpeaks by her becauſe he does credit her vvith ſo many miracles and ſupernatural Marks, vvhich makes it euidently credible, that he does ſpeake by her.* Where you diſtinguish the *Motiue* of your Act of Faith, from the *Motiue* of your *obligation* of belieuing, and *your iudgment* of credibility: the *Motiue*, that you giue for your Act of Faith, is only the word or voyce of God by the Church: (and nothing els but the word of God can be the Motiue of Faith.) the Motiue you giue for your *obligation* of

believing, and *iudgment of credibility*; are the external inducements of miracles and supernatural signs. You reply: To believe that God speaks by the Church, because the Church by which God speaks sayes so; is to believe that God speaks, because Gods speaks by the Church; which is *idem per idem*: to believe a thing for itself; and an obscure thing, for a thing equally obscure; which is vnreasonable; wheras an obscure vnknowen thing cānot be believed but for somthing that is more cleer and knowen. I answer, what is believed, is that God speaks by the Church, which is obscure and vnknowen to our reason: The *Motiue*, why wee believe it, is the voyce of God by the Church, euidently proposed to our vnderstanding by the external Motiues of credibility to be credibly his voyce; so that the same thing which of itself, and considered without the external Motiues of credibility, is obscure and vnknowen; acompanied with the motiues of credibility is more cleer and knowen and moues me to believe: but so, that the Motiues of credibility are not the *Motiue*, nor any part of the *Motiue* why I believe the testimony of the Church to be the voyce of God; but are the Motiues why our vnderstanding

euidently knows it to be very credible, and iudges it very iuſt and reaſonable that wee should beliue it to be the voyce of God.

And that this is the way of Reſoluing Diuine Faith, its proued; for wee haue the ſame Faith, that the Primitiue Church of Ieruſalem, Antioch, and Damaſco had: and conſequently wee muſt haue the ſame *Motiue* of Faith. When the Apoſtles preached to them, they beliued the Trinity, not for Scripture; for but little or nothing was then written of the new Teſtament; but becauſe God told them by the Apoſtles that it was a reuealed Truth. And if you did ask them, whey they beliued that God did ſpeake by the Apoſtles? they would anſwer, becauſe the Apoſtles who were Gods Meſſengers told them ſo, and they could not but be obliged to beliue it becauſe of their miracles and ſupernatural ſigns. Thus wee ſay of the Church.

Now the Church being beliued infallibly true; wee beliue the Scripture to be the word of God vpon her teſtimony; and the Scripture being beliued Gods word; then wee draw out of the Scripture, new proofs and Motiues of beliuing the Church to be infallible; becauſe the Scripture, which is the word of God ſayes it.

But the chief and laſt Motiue whervpon our Faith muſt reſt, is the word of God ſpeaking to vs by the Church: the Church, I ſay by which God actually, in this preſent age ſpeaks vnto vs: for wee do not belieue becauſe God did ſpeak in the 1. 2. and third age by the Church; for that is *Tradition*, and Tradition (nor Scripture) is not the *Motiue*, but the *Rule* of our Faith; the *Rule* by which the Church is guided to know which and what is the word of God: the *Motiue* of our Faith, is becauſe God ſpeaks now, by his Church, as he did in thoſe firſt ages; for which wee haue euident arguments of credibility as the firſt ages had.

Pop's ſupremacy.

What is belieued, as an Article of Faith by the Church, is the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the Pope: his ſupream Power either *Direct* or *indirect* in temporal affaires ouer Princes, is no Articles of Faith; but a queſtion diſputed in the ſchools, and neither Partie, that denies or affirms is condemned of Hereſy by the Church; if Mr Sall mislyked the Doctrin he might haue diſclaimed it, and remain a Catholick, as many

other Catholicks do. He ſpeaks of the ſufferances of the *Irish* vpon the account of this Doctrin, a meer fiction, as wittily, as maliciously inuented to make the Pope odious to the People: That the Irish should haue ſuffered for that cauſe, is falſe, but its very true that they ſuffered for not ſwearing the contrary Doctrin, *That the Pope has no ſuch Powver*; which no man can ſweare wheras he is not certain of it; and wheras it is a queſtion diſputed in the ſchools if he has or not, that Power; how can any man in conſcience ſweare either part to be true? but what Mr Sall might well condole is the ſufferances of the Irish for not taking the oath of ſupremacy, that the King of England is head of the Church, and let him conſider if it be not cruelty againſt ſoules, to oblige them to ſweare a thing that, not only Catholicks, but all ſectaries out of England denies, nay Caluin in cap. 6. *Amos Propheta* ſayes. *Qui tantopere extulerunt Henricum Regem Angliæ, fuerunt homines inconſiderati, erant enim Blaſphemi, cum eum vocarent ſummum Caput Eccleſiæ.* And the very Proteſtant Doctors themſelues not agreeing, in what ſence, and how far is it true that the King is ſupream Head of the Church, the poore Peo-

ple must be forced to sweare it.

Then, say you, the Council of Lateran erred in assuming that Power, when it decreed Princes, who did not purge their Territories from Heresies, should be depriued of their Lands. You abuse the Council; neither it, nor any other Council did no *assume that Powver*, as you say, but finding that is was that the probable, and perhaps, as they supposed the most probable opinion of Diuins, that the Church had that power, grounded their *fact* vpon that opinion; and issued their Decree of that punishment against such Princes: And the Catholicks, who deny any such Power in the Church do not, nor any man cannot say, the Council erred *formally* (that's to say *blameably*) in that Decree; because it was grounded vpon a probable opinion; and it is not requisit in any Tribunal for the iustice of a Decree or sentence, that it be grounded vpon infallible grounds. And the Catholicks who deny that power do say, that Decree was *Materially* erroneous, because the opinion vpon which the Council was grounded, was false. whence you can only gather that the Council may err *Materially* only, in matters of *fact*, (such as

that was) but in *Doctrina fidei & morum*, in Doctrin of *Faith* and *Manners*, it cannot err, neither formally nor Materially, becauſe it is aſſiſted in that Doctrin conſtantly by Gods infallible Spirit.

Tranſubſtantiation.

How ſtrangly Mr Sall is blinded in calling vs Idolaters, for believing Chriſts real perſonal Preſence in the Sacrament; and pag. 116. ſayes wee will be damned for this, and orher Tenets, if ignorance does not excuſe vs; and yet the Lutherans who are the Elder Brethren of the pretended Reformation; whom Proteſtants do embrace, and receiue to their Communion; believe that real perſonal Preſence of Chriſt as well as wee: are they Idolaters alſo; and will they be damn'd, if ignorance does not excuſe them? or will it be pardonable in them, and damnable in vs?

He ſayes wee haue no pertinent text of ſcripture for it, pag. 21. and 28. but I defy him with all his Diuinity, to anſwer me to theſe two following ſyllogiſm, grounded vpon moſt cleer texts: firſt Luk. 22. 19. *eate, this is my Body vvhich is giuen for you.* The text declares he gaue them ſom-

what to eat: wee ſay it was his Real Body, and proue it: He gaue *to* them, that which he gaue *for* them: the text ſayes it, *eat, this is my Body vvhich is giuen for you.* But what he gaue *for* them, was not a figure, but his real and true Body; therefore what he gaue *to* them was not a figure, but his true and Real Body. it will be no anſwer, to ſay that he gaue *to* them *figuratiuely*, what he gaue *for* them *really*; for the text makes no diſtinction, betwixt what he gaue *to* them, and what he gaue *for* them; and if you preſume to ſay, that what he gaue *to* them, was but a figuratiue; why may not wee as well ſay, that what he gaue *for* them, was but a figure, and ſo fetch from Hell again the Hereſy of *Marcion*, that what ſuffered for vs, was but a Phantaſtical Body?

For to leade you the ſecond ſyllogiſm, obſerue that when the Multitude Io. 6. ſaid, *This ſaying is hard, hovv can this man giue vs his flesh to eate*; Chriſt called them *Vnbelieuers*: *There be ſom of you, vvho do not belieue*; nay ſayes, they are *damnable vnbelieuers*, v. 54, *He that vvill not eat of the flesh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood, shall not haue lyfe in him.* Obſerue ſecondly, that what the Iews though hard, and *im-*

poßible, was that Christ should giue them to eate his *true* and *real flesh*, for no man could apprehend any difficulty in that Christ should giue the figure of his Body, wheras they did eat yearly the Paschal Lamb, which they belieued to be the figure, of the Messias; Christ promised what they iudged *hard* and *impoßible*; what they iudged *hard* and *impoßible*, was not that he should giue a *figure* of his flesh, but his *true* and *real flesh*; therefore what Christ promised was not a figure but his real and true flesh: and Mr Sall himself, pag. 63. does acknowledge, that the Iews did vnderstand Christ to haue spoken of his true and real flesh: *The Iewvs vnderstood him to haue spoken of a corporal and fleshy eating, as the Papists do.* Now answer me, I pray, to this syllogism: A damnable vnbelieuer is he who denies a Truth sufficiently proposed to him to be reuealed by God; The Iewes in this occasion were damnable vnbelieuers, and what they denied was a fleshy eating of his real Body, as the Papists belieue it: therefore Christ in this occasion did sufficiently propose vnto them a fleashy eating of his real Body as the Papists belieue it.

Pag. 63. he rayses an argument vpon this text for the figuratiue presence: for sayes

he the Iewes vnderſtood him to ſpeake of a corporal and fleshy eating of his Body, as Papiſts do, and ſo repreſented difficulties that reaſon dictated againſt the lyke expreſsions, as vvee did in the beginning of this diſcourſe; but he did correct their vnderſtanding, by his ſubſequent vvords, v. 63. *it is the ſpirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the vvords that I ſpeak are ſpirit and lyfe by vvhich he dravveth them from the apprehenſion of a corporal eating, to that of a ſpiritual feeding:* conſequently Chriſt did meane a figuratiue ſpiritual eating of his flesh: thus Mr Sall.

By this, you acknowledge, that the Iews did not apprehend or think of any figuratiue eating, conſequently they could not either belieue it, or deny it; for how can a man deny, that which neuer fell into his apprehenſions: tell vs therefore what is that which they denyed, and denyed damnably? they could not deny, but that which they apprehended was ſpoken; and what they apprehended, as you confeſs, was a corporal fleshy eating. That therefore they muſt haue denyed; therefore they were called *vnbelieuers*: but how were they *damnably* vnbelieuers, if Chriſt did not ſufficiently and credibly propoſe vnto them a corporal and fleshly eating? For none is

bound to belieue, if the reuealed Truth be not ſufficiently and credibly propoſed to him? either therefore Chriſt his words, *My flesh is truly meat, my Blood is truly drink*, did ſufficiently and credibly propoſe a corporal eating of his real flesh, or they ought not to be called *damnably vnbelieuers*. They would not belieue that corporal eating of his real flesh, as you do not, for the difficulties which reaſon dictated againſt the lyke expreſſions; ſuch as you, and your fraternity, propoſes againſt them; and therefore wee ſay, that you are damnably *vnbelieuers*, as they were, and you, and they are checkt by thoſe wordes of Chriſt, *the flesh profiteth nothing, its the ſpirit that quickneth, &c*, which were not to check their vnderſtanding for apprehending a corporal eating; but to check their obſtinacy, that for the difficulties, which natural reaſon did ſuggeſt againſt his expreſſions, they would not belieue, what he ſpoke, and they vnderſtood him to haue ſpoken: *the flesh profiteth nothing*, that was to ſay to them and to you, that they muſt not iudge of this Myſtery by the ſenſes of the flesh, nor by natural reaſon which is adquired by the help of the fleshy ſenſes, They cannot vnderſtand how that can be:

Its the ſpirit that quickneth, thats to ſay, its the Diuine grace, that muſt enlighten your vnderſtandings to know and beleeue how this can be. Euen as when S. Peter confeſſed Chriſt to be *the ſon of the liuing God*, Chriſt added, *its not flesh and blood that reuealed that vnto thee, but my Father that is in heauen*, Mat. 16 17. which was to ſay; that it was not natural reaſon, nor any knowledge of the ſenſes of flesh, or gotten by them; but the grace of the heauenly Father that diſcouered that Myſtery to him.

If you reade that paſſage in S. Io. 6. you will find, that Chriſt as wee haue euidently proued, propoſed a corporal eating of his real flesh, but did not at all then (which is to be obſerued) propoſe the manner, how he would giue his flesh to be eaten. The obligation of the Iews was to beleeue that he would giue it; and not to diſpute, *howv* that could be, or in what manner: but they began to think how it could be, *quomodo poteſt*, &c. and their natural reaſon, (which only they conſulted) not vnderſtanding that it could be otherwyſe, than by cutting his flesh in morſels to be giuen to them, this appearing ſo abſurd to human reaſon, they abſolutly denyed, the poſſibility of the Myſtery. If Chriſt when he

propoſed

propoſed to them his flesh for food, had alſo propoſed the manner that he intended of giuing it, perhaps they would haue belieued, but then he did not, but only the eating of his flesh. Their error was two fold; the one, that they denyed the poſſibility of giuing his flesh to be eaten; for which they were called vnbelieuers: the other was the cauſe, why they denyed it; becauſe the manner of eating it which their natural reaſon propoſed vnto them, appeared abſurd, and therefore not conceiuing how it could be they denyed it; therefore Chriſt checkt this their vnderſtanding, that the manner of giuing his flesh really to be eaten was in a ſpiritual way, aboue what their natural reaſon could apprehend, and ſayd *its the Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing*; as wee haue expounded: but they, either becauſe they did not vnderſtand this expreſſion, or that they obſtinatly adheared to their firſt denyal, flincht from him.

I conclude with this reaſon: you will not deny but that God might, if he were pleaſed, haue conuerted the ſubſtance of that bread, which he took in his hands, into his real flesh and Body; as by his omnipotent word he created all things of no-

thing; as he conuerted the water into wyne; and as the bread, which wee eat, is by the heat of our ſtomacks conuerted into our flesh and blood: ſuppoſe, I pray, that he intended at the laſt ſupper to make ſuch a change; or that now he deſcended from heauen to make it: what words could he vſe, more ſignificant, to let vs vnderſtand that he gaue vs his real and true Body vnder the Accidents of bread, than thoſe, *take, eat, this is my Body vvhich is giuen for you, this is truly my flesh:* if in a ſerious diſcourſe I promiſed you a horſe; would not you vnderſtand that I intended to giue you a true horſe? would I perform my promomiſs by giuing the figure of one? ſince then that he might haue giuen vs, if he had been pleaſed, his true and real Body, and that he ſpoke, as if really he did intend it, (for he could not ſpeake otherwyſe if he did) wee muſt vnderſtand that he did intend it, and gaue it. If he did intend it, when he ſpoke thoſe words; what could hinder him? if he did not intend it; was it ſincerity and honeſty to ſpeake otherwyſe, than as he intended? no more than if you, hauing promiſed a horſe, would giue only the picture of one.

Let vs heare Mr Salls arguments; he begins, as the Iews, with difficulties that reason proposes against so great a Mystery; that the Accidents of bread should be without any substance to rest on, that a Body would be at one tyme in many places; that a well proportioned body should be confined to the smale compass of a wafer; that the Accidents conuerted into vermin should produce a substance. I would tyre my Readers patience, if I did scan each triuial objection of these that has been a hundred tymes answered, and our answers neuer replyed vnto. You would haue shewen more wit, Mr Sall, and got more credit by replying to the answers, that our writers giue to these objections and especially Bellarmin from whom you borrow them, than by repeating again a parcel of thrid bare tryfles, against so great a Mystery, in homage of which, wee must captiuat our sence and reason, as wee do to the Mystery of the Trinity, which surpasseth all created intellects, far more than this Mystery and yet not so cleerly expressed in Scripture, as this is. And if you must haue natural reason, for to belieue this Mystery, tell me, what reason haue you for to belieue

that the Bread and wyne giueth lyfe and grace to the worthy eater? what proportion can reaſon find betwixt bread, and Diuin grace? what proportion betwixt the water of Baptiſm, and ſpiritual Regeneration? none, if you do not appeale to the omnipotency of God: by he ſame wee anſwer you alſo, (to shun tedious Tatalogyes) that thoſe difficulties you repreſent be impoſſible to Nature but they are poſſible to the omnipotent word of God.

But for the ſatisfaction of the Reader I will deliuer this argument in the terms of an ingenious man which once I diſcourſed with. This Myſtery, ſaid he, is repugnant to ſenſe and reaſon; conſequently it is not to be impoſed on man, if God will not haue him to renounce both. Its repugnant to ſenſe, for what wee ſee, taſt, and feel, is but bread: repugnant to reaſon; for this ought prudently to conclude, that the ſubſtance of bread is there, vpon the teſtimony of the ſenſes, which perceiue the Accidents that, by natural courſe, are inſeparable from the ſubſtance of bread. I anſwer, Reaſon prudently ought to conclude the ſubſtance of bread is there, wheras the ſenſes per-

ceiue the Accidents, which are naturally inſeparable from that ſubſtance, if there were not a higher Authority that affirms the ſubſtance is not there; to whoſe teſtimony, Reaſon is bound to yield, againſt the euidence of the ſenſes: as when the Angel appeared to Tobias to acompany him in his voyage; Tobias, at his firſt appearance ch. 5. prudently iudged him to be a Man, wheras the ſenſes did perceiue all the Accidents proper to human Nature; and nothing affirmed him to be an Angel: there Reaſon prudently concluded vpon the teſtimony of the ſenſes: but when in the 12. ch. the Angel diſcouered him ſelf to be an Angel; then Tobias his reaſon was reclaymed, and againſt the euidence of his ſenſes, which did ſee nothing but Accidents of Human Nature; belieued it a Spirit vpon the teſtimony of an Angel. The lyke paſſage wee read to haue happened to Abraham, Gen. 18. whence wee vnderſtand, that God may ſeparat the Accidents from the ſubſtance to which they are proper; and alſo that when the teſtimony of our ſenſes clashs with a higher Authority, Reaſon muſt yield to the higher Authority, againſt the euidence of our ſenſes.

This is the preſent caſe: our ſenſes ſay

its bread what wee ſee after the conſecration: the word of God ſayes its his Body; if the word of God did not ouerawe the ſenſes, reaſon ought prudently to conclude its *bread*; but the word of God being of a more infallible authority than the ſenſes, Reaſon muſt yield to the word of God, and ſay its Chriſts *Body*; againſt the euidence of the ſenſes that ſaye its *bread*.

But replyed he, God will not haue Reaſon go againſt the euidence of our ſenſes, but yeld to them euen in matters of Faith, for after his Reſurrection he proued it to his Apoſtles by the euidence of their ſenſes, ſaying Lu. 24. 36. *feele and ſee for a Spirit hath no flesh nor boans as you ſee me to haue.* I anſwer, they did not believe his Reſurrection only vpon the teſtimony of their ſenſes, but alſo of his word and aſſeueration, that ſaid he was reuiued. God will haue vs, as I ſaid formerly, yield to the euidence of our ſenſes, when there is no higher autority that thwarts their euidence, as heere there was none, but the higher autority did rather aſſert, what the ſenſes did teſtifie, but in the Myſtery of the Euchariſt it is not ſo; Gods word does contradict the ſenſes, and therefore Reaſon muſt, yield to it againſt our ſenſations.

Pag. 21. Mr Sall argues, that no neceſſity vrges vs to belieue Chriſts real preſence in the Sacrament; neither for the effects that he promiſes by it: not for the verifying of his words, ſeeing our ſauiour ſaid in the ſame tenor, *I am the true vine*; without any alteration in the vine, or his perſon: not for the effects of the Sacrament; Chriſt being able to conferr, what ſpiritual graces he pleaſes, with the worthy receiuing of bread and wyne, without any ſubſtantial alteration in the Elements; as in the water of Baptiſm he affordeth the ſoueraign grace of ſpiritual regeneration in the ſubſtance of water.

I anſwer, its neceſſary for the verifying of Chriſts words in the inſtitution of the Sacrament: for let the words *Body* and *flesh*, *vine*, *Rock* &c. be *equiuocal*, as he will haue them to be; indifferent to beare two ſences *figuratiue* and *real*. This is euident, that when a word bearing an *equiuocal* ſignification, is put in a Propoſition, it is determined to ſignify that, of which only, and of no other, the *Predicat* can be verifyed: as this word *Man*, may ſignify a true, or painted man: in this propoſition *Man is a rational liuing creature*, it is determined to ſignify a true Man; becauſe

the *Predicat*, *rational liuing creature*, can be verifyed only of him, and not of a painted man. So the word *Body*, that may ſignify a true, or figuratiue one; in the inſtitution of the Sacrament, *This is my body vvhich is giuen for you*, its determined to ſignify Chriſt his true body, becauſe of it only, and not of a figure, it can be verifyed *vvhich is giuen for you*. If you obſerue this Principle, you will cleerly anſwer any text that may be alleadged againſt this Myſtery. As to the inſtance of *vine* and ſuch lyke myſtical expreſſions ſpoken of Chriſt, put them in a propoſition with the word *Chriſt*, and they will be determined to a figuratiue or myſtical ſignification, becauſe that *Chriſt that dyed for* vs cannot be ſaid of a vine or Rock in their proper ſignification.

Now to the ſecond part of his argument: that God might, had he been pleaſed, haue redeemed vs, with out any real Incarnation of the ſecond Perſon, or real Paſſion of Chriſt vpon the Croſs, its out of controuerſy; for his infinit wysdom and Power, wanted not other means for to redeem vs: is it therefore wee muſt ſay, with the Heretick *Marcion*, that the text, *And the vvord vvas made flesh*, muſt be

vnderſtood figuratiuly, and deny any real Incarnation of Chriſt, or Paſſion, on the Croſs, but only a figuratiue one? by your argument wee might, becauſe God might, had he been pleaſed, conuey vnto vs by a figuratiue body and Paſſion, all the effects and grace, that he conueyed vnto vs by a real Incarnation and Paſſion: the ſpiritual regeneration, conferred on vs in Baptiſm by water, he might haue conferred it on vs by wine or Roſe water: is it therefore wee muſt ſay that true natural water is not neceſſary for Baptiſm? but ſay you, the text does diſtinctly expreſs *vvater*; yea, and the text in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt does diſtinctly expreſs *Body*: and as the text does not add, *true*, and *real* Body, ſo it does not add *true* and *natural* water; by what rule, muſt *vvater* in the text ſygnify *natural* water, and the word *Body*, muſt not ſygnify a real body?

Thus farr wee agree that Chriſt might, were he pleaſed, haue giuen vs the effects of the Sacramēt by a figuratiue Preſence only; alſo that he might haue conferred them vpon vs by the real preſence of his Body (for there is no impoſſibility in that he ſhould haue giuen vs his real Body vnder the Accidents of bread) the queſtion is, what is it

that he has effectually don, and which of the two has he giuen, the figure of his Body, or his real Body? I say that his real Body, for that is requisit for the verifying of his words in the institution of the Sacrament.

But why does S. Paul call it *Bread* so often; euen after the consecration? as 1. Cor. 11. 13. *as often as you eat this bread, vvhoeuer shall eat this bread, he took bread in his hands he brake it and said this is my Body vvhich is broken for you.* These expressions denote, that it remayns still bread. No M' Sall, it retains the name of bread, because it retains the appearance of bread, and because that when a thing is changed into an other, it still retains the name of what it was, as in the Scripture wee read, *the blind see, the lame vvalk*; though they see, they are called *blind*, because they were blind, and are restored to their sight. And S. Io. 2. 9. sayes; *vvhen the Ruler of the feast, had tasted the vvater, that vvas made vvine.* The liquor that the Ruler of the feast tasted was true wine; yet the text calls it *vvater*, because from water it was conuerted into wine. So the bread, which by the words of the consecration, is conuerted into Christ his Body, retains the name of bread, because it was once bread; because it has

ſtill the appearance of bread, and becauſe wee ſhould vnderſtand, that true bread and wyne, and nothing but bread and wyne, is requiſit for the due adminiſtration of that Sacrament; as for the Baptiſm true natural water is neceſſary.

And that you may not be ſtartled at S. Pauls calling it ſo often *bread*, obſerue you the rule I haue giuen, and you will eaſily perceiue that the word *bread* ſo often vſed after the conſecration, ſignifyes not true and real bread, but beares only a myſtical or figuratiue ſignification, for you will find that the Predicats that are ſaid of that bread after its conſecration, cannot, in any wyſe, be verified of true ſubſtantial bread; and conſequently that the word *bread* after the conſecration cannot ſignify real, but figuratiue bread, for example Chriſt ſayes of that bread that S. Paul ſpeakes of; *the bread that I ſhall giue is flesh for the lyfe of the vvorld*: what was giuen for the lyfe of the world, was not *true bread*, but *true flesh*, conſequently when that flesh is called bread, the word *bread* muſt not ſignify real bread. Chriſt ſayes of that bread, *this is my Body, vvhich is giuen for you*: This Predicat, *vvhich is giuen for you*, cannot be verified of bread, in its true and proper

ſignification ; conſequently the word *bread* after the conſecration, ſignifyes but figuratiue bread, the appearance of bread.

But ſayes Mr Sall, wee all agree in calling the Eucharift a Sacrament, a Sacrament is but a ſign of a ſacred thing ; why ſhould not wee agree alſo, in calling the Sacrament of Chriſt his body, *the ſign of Chriſt his Body*: and heere he brings a rapſody of texts of S. Auguſtin, S. Denis, and others, to proue that it is but a type, a Symbol, a figure, and remembrance of Chriſt his Body, which labor he might haue well ſpared; for wee do freely grant that the Eurachiſt is a ſign, type, remembrance and Symbol of Chriſt his body offered for vs on the Croſs; the Eucharift is a commemoration, and repreſentation of that bloody ſacrifice ; but it is alſo Chriſt his true Body: the vnbloody oblation of his Body in the Eucharift, is a figure and repreſentation of the bloody oblation of the ſame body on the Croſs ; as a King that would act a Part in a tragedy of his own victoryes, he would be the thing repreſented and the repreſentation. He alleadges the words of ſome Fathers of the Church, that expresly ſay the Symbols in the Sacrament are not

changed in their Nature, but do abyde in their proper *ſubſtance*, *figure* and *form*: nay, more diſtinctly, they ſay, that the Nature and ſubſtance of *bread* and *vvyne* remaine after the conſecration: thus ſpeaks Saint Chryſoſt. if you belieue M. Sall, in an epiſtle he writ ad Cæſarium; but if you belieue Bellarmin, S. Chryſoſt. neuer writ any ſuch epiſtle: alſo Gelaſius, a Pope ſayes M. Sall, though Bellarmin ſayes he was no Pope but ſom Monk) and Theodoret dial. 2. c. 24. And is it not a pretty thing that the Proteſtants would perſwade vs, that theſe Fathers and others, did belieue only a figuratiue Preſence, and yet from the very firſt begining of their pretended Reformation they conſtantly auerr, that all the Fathers fell into the errours of Purgatory, real Preſence, Adoration of Saints, &c. whoeuer will read thoſe Fathers will find the real Preſence moſt cleerly aſſerted in ſeueral places of their works; eſpecially in S. Chryſoſt.; and for one or two obſcure paſſages, or expreſſions, that our Aduerſaryes meet, with they muſt be for a figuratiue Preſence? Bellarmin and our Catholick Authors, giue a Catholick ſence to thoſe words; the Proteſtants giue an other, the Fathers do not liue to ſpeake for them-

ſelues and declare what ſenſe they intended: is it not neceſſary therefore, that wee should haue an infallible liuing iudge, who may deliuer vnto vs, what wee muſt belieue in this Myſtery?

This aduertiſment I muſt giue my Reader; that the Fathers in all ages of the Church, ſome ſpoke nothing at all of the Myſteryes now controuerted, and believed by vs, others ſpoke of them but briefly and obſcurely; others wrote in ſome places of their works plainly, and diſtinctly; but in other places in expreſſions, ſubiect to misconſtruction. The reaſon was, that the Fathers of each age profeſſedly writ, or altogether, or for the moſt part of their works, of thoſe points of doctrin which were oppoſed by the Hereticks of thoſe tymes, and thoſe they deliuered in their proper Notions, expresly, and carefully, shunning any dubious words; but of other Myſteryes and Articles of Faith, that were vnanimously believed, no contradiction of Hereticks requiring an exact diſcuſſion of them; either they omitted to ſpeake of them, or writing of them, they were not ſo carefull in ſpeaking with cleer expreſſions, becauſe they had no occaſion of fearing a misconſtruction of their words; par-

ticularly when in other places of their works, they had deliuered themſelues in plain terms. Hence it is that wee muſt not be ſtartled if wee do not find any mention of Indulgences, Purgatory, or real Preſence in ſome Fathers; or if wee meet ſome words in ſome Fathers, which may be wreſted againſt our Tenets; as in this of the real Preſence, which vntill about the yeare 800. had not any oppoſition among Chriſtians, then it was appoſed by Iohn Scotus (not the Franciſcan fryer) and by the Arch Bishop of *Sens* in France: but this ſtorm was ſoon and eaſily calm'd: about the yeare 1100. *Berengarius* rayſed much duſt againſt this Myſtery, and drew many Abettors to his faction; then the Catholick writters did declare the Myſtery and defend it, and *Berengarius* was condemned by fiue Councils ſucceſſiuly aſſembled againſt him and his Partizans: the Fathers who writ ſince that tyme ſpeake ſo manifeſtly in fauor of the real Preſence, that you will hardly find any expreſſion in their works wherat your vnderſtanding may ſtumble.

Its moſt falſe what Mr Sall imputes to Scotus, Ocham and other more modern Catholicks, that the doctrin of Tranſubſtan-

tiation, it not contained in the Canon, nor was an Article of Faith before the Lateran Council; they expresly teach, especialy Scotus in 4. dist. 11. q 3. that the doctrin was believed before the Council, continually in the Church; but more explicitly declared by the Council, who for that end introduced the word *Transubstantiation*, which expresses better the doctrin believed, as the Council of Nice introduced the word *Consubstantial*, to signify the equality of the son with the Father: nay Scotus in that place brings for example the Creed of the Nicen Council which, sayes he, was no new doctrin of the Council, but a more explicit declaration of the sence formerly believed by the Church; so the Decree of the Lateran Council was but an explicit declaration of the sence that was held by the Church in all ages in this point of the real Presence. *Suarez* indeed tells vs, that Caietan (but speaks nothing of Bassoly, so much you add of your own) spoke rashly of this Mystery, but tells vs also that his expressions were censured by the Church; and all that Mr Sall can proue by this, is that Caietan did err: and what then?

But sayes he Bellarmin and the Roman writers do agree that in that text, *this*

Cup

Cup is the newe Teſtament of my blood, the word *Cup*, is taken by a Trope, not for the material Cup, but for the thing it contains; and why will wee not alſo admit a Trope, in the words relating to the bread conſecrated. Mr Sall playes the Catholick vndoubtedly vnder the maſk of Proteſtancy, for this argument proues manifeſtly our Doctrin: wee confeſs that in the text alleadged, the word *Cup* muſt be taken, by a Trope, for what it contains, not for the material *Cup*; ſo wee deſire him that in this text *the bread vvhich I vvil giue is flesh for the lyfe of the vvorld*, the word *bread*, may be taken by a Trope, not for the material bread, but for what it contains which wee proue to be in the *Cup*, the true blood of Chriſt (becauſe of it, and not of the material *Cup*, it can be verifyed that it was shed for vs) in the *bread*, the true flesh of Chriſt; for of it, and not of the material bread, that Predicat can be verifyed, *giuen for the lyfe of the vvorld*.

He concludes with a diſcourſe which ſhocks the Hierarchy of the Church of England. Mr Anderton has lately proued in his iudicious Treatyſe ſtiled *a Soueraign Remedy againſt Atheiſm and Hereſy*, the Nul-

lity of the Proteſtant Clergy and Mr Sall not ſufficiently as yet engaged in the defence of that cauſe (as wee may iudge by his ſo weake oppoſition of our Tenets, and defence of theirs, that he has not as yet got ſo great aduantages by his Reuolt, as he expected, that should edge his wit to plead with more vigor) I know not with what deſign ſtrengthens this Aſſertion with his following argument againſt our Adoring of Chriſt in the Sacrament. How can you (ſayes he) giue Diuin Adoration to the wafer! wheras in your own Principles you cannot be ſure that Chriſt is there preſent: for in your Principles, That depends of the intention of the Prieſt who conſecrats, and of his true ordination; this depends of the intention, and due ordinatiõ of the Bishop that ordained him; and this Bishop depends of the true ordination of others that conſecrated him; and ſo vpwards of endleſs requiſits, impoſſible to be knowen certainly: conſequently you cannot certainly know, that Chriſt is preſent in that wafer; how then are you ſo deſperat as to adore it?

Anſwer: its queſtion leſs on both ſydes, yours and ours, that ſom things are eſſentially requiſit for the validity of a Sacra-

ment; the defect of which, or any one thing of them nullifyes the Sacrament: as, for the validity of Baptism, water is essentially necessary; and the form of words, *I baptize you in the name of the Father Son and Holy Ghost.* This you believe as well as wee, now who doubts, but that it depends of the free will of the Minister to vitiat the form; for since that the validity of the Baptism does not require, that he vters the form in aloud voyce, he may pretend to speak the form, and vter som what els in lieu of it: or if he should pronounce some words of it with an audible voyce, he may, with an vnder voyce omit some word, or add som word, that would destroy the form; this may happen through malice or ignorance: and wee cannot possibly be certain, that it does not, or has not happened; and consequently wee can haue no assurance (if Mr Salls discourse be good) of the truth of any mans Baptism. The ordination of your Ministers depends essentially, in your Principles also, as well as in ours, of the Iurisdiction of the Bishop (for if he be no true Bishop he can giue no orders) and of the exact form, or words essentially requisit for a due ordination: the Iurisdiction of the Bishop depends of the due ordina-

tion of the Conſecrators (for he muſt be conſecrated by the impoſition of hands of true Bishops) and the vttering of the form of Conſecration; the due ordination of the Conſecrators depends of the like requiſits in thoſe from whom they receiued their Caracter: now ſince that the defect, either of the true *form* of the Conſecration, or of the true Ordination of the Conſecrators, nullifies your Hierarchy; and that there is no poſſible means for vs to know certainly that neither of thoſe two, was wanting, in any one of the whole trayn of your Ordainers; for if it was wanting in any all the Ordinations deriued from him, are Null, what aſſurance haue you, or can you haue of the truth of your Hierarchy, and but that you are all buth meer laymen without any authority, or iuriſdiction for preaching or adminiſtring Sacraments? Thus Mr Sall obliges his Church in opening a way to queſtion the Iuriſdiction of the Clergy: let him make his peace, as he can, with his Church and Clergy, wee will anſwer his obiection thus.

Wee can without hazard of Idolatry, and ought in conſcience to adore the wafer conſecrated, though wee be not infal-

libly assured of the Priests intention: for our obligation of adoring is grounded on, and guided by that General Principle of Faith (which is infallibly true) that Christ is really present in the wafer duely consecrated; this General Principle applied to this particular case of *this wafer*, consecrated by *this Priest*, obliges me to adore this wafer, though that application of the said general Principle be not infallibly sure, or I am not infallibly ascertained that it is applyed in this particular case: it is sufficient for my obligation of adoring, that I am morally assured that it is applyed. As in this case, this General Principle of Nature, *Parents are to be honored by their children*, is infallibly true and just; and grounds an obligation in all children to honor their Parents: in virtue of this general Principle applyed this particular Man and woman that are your Parents, you are obliged to honor them; but are you infallibly assured that these are your Parents? not at all: are not you not withstanding obliged to honor them? is it rashness or folly in you to honor them? for though the general Principle that Parents must be honored be infallibly true and just, yet you are not infallibly assured, that this

general Principle is duely applyed to these in particular; but for your obligation that is not requisit; its sufficient that you are morally assured: this is our case in the adoration of the Host. And hence wee cannot: but condemn your *intollerable* rashnes in saying that, *its an intollerable boldnes* to auer, that there is the same reason for the adoration of the Host as there is for the adoration of Christs Diuinity; for if you vnderstand our Doctrin, which is that there is *as much reason for adoring an Host truly consecrated as there is for adoring the Diuinity of Christ*; it is most manifestly true, wheras Faith teacheth vs that the Host truly consecrated is God and man, Iesus Christ really present. If you do not vnderstand our doctrin its intollerable rashnes in you to censure what you do not vnderstand.

Half Communion.

We will declare our Tener by a comparison of the Communion, with the Sacrament of Baptism; both are commanded by Christ: *if one be not born again by water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the King dom of Heauen* Io. c. 6. and in the same chap. *if you do not eate the flesh of the*

Son of Man, and drink his bloud, you shall not have lyfe in you.

In the Sacrament of Baptiſm, you muſt diſtinguish the *ſubſtance* and *eſſence* of it, from the circumſtances and manner of receiuing it. The ſubſtance and eſſence of it conſiſts, in being regenerated by water; for that is required by Chriſt expresly in the text: the manner how this regeneration is made, is by one total immerſion of the Body in water; or by three diſtinct immerſions; or without any total immerſion, but by ſprinkling ſome principal part of the Body with water. what concerns the eſſence of this Sacrament, *to be by water*, is indiſpenſably requiſit; cannot be altered: what concerns the manner of receiuing it; Chriſt left that arbitrary to the Church, and did not oblige either to one total immerſion, nor to three, nor to ſprinkling but to either of the three wayes. Hence it is, that though Chriſt did baptize the Apoſtles with a total immerſion of their Bodyes; as Ancient Authors do auerr, (if by three or one immerſion wee know not) though this manner of Baptizing by a total immerſion was practiſed by the firſt age; and ſome ages of the Church; and that wee do not

reade that Baptiſm should haue been administred in those ages by a ſprinkling of the Body with water; yet the Church in ſucceeding ages, for iuſt reaſons requiring it, has ſeuetal tymes altered this manner; ſome tyme they ordained that Baptiſm should be giuen with three total immerſions; in hatred of the Hereſy of them that denyed three perſons in God; and to ſignify that there was in God, but vnity as well in Perſon as in Nature, would not baptize but with one immerſion. Some tyme, the Church commanded Baptiſm to be giuen with one immerſion, in oppoſition of Hereticks, that would not baptize but with three: to ſignify that the three Perſons were of different Natures. Thus you will find that in the 50. Canon of the Apoſtles three immerſions are commanded; in the 4. Council of Toledo, but One: S. Gregory writing to S. Leander, ſayes it may be adminiſtred either of both wayes: and laſtly the Church in conſideration that many Infants eſpecially in the Northren Kingdoms through the Coldneſs of the Climat, dyed by the total immerſion of their Bodyes, commanded the Sacrament should be adminiſtred with the ſprinkling of ſome principal part of the

Body with water; and this manner is vſed, alſo by the Proteſtants; who do not rebuke the Church for omitting the triple immerſion practiſed by the Apoſtles.

Thus in the Euchariſt wee muſt diſtinguish the eſſence of it, from the circumſtances: *That* conſiſts in eating and drinking the Body and blood, either vnder Accidents of bread alone, or wine alone, or bread and wine together; this is indiſpenſably requiſit: to neither in particular did Chriſt oblige vs, but left it arbitrary to the Church to determin as tymes, and iuſt occaſions required: and that Chriſt did not oblige vs to any of theſe different manners in particular, but left it arbitrary to the Church; firſt the text it ſelf declares it, for when he gaue the Cup, he did not abſolutly command the vſe of it ſaying *Do this in commemoration of me*, but, *Do this, as often as you ſhall drink, in commemoration of me*; which is not a command of Drinking, but when wee ſhall drink, to do it in commemoration of him. Secondly wee haue a poſitiue example of Chriſt himſelf, that once gaue the Communion in the accidents of bread alone, to his diſciples in the way towards Emaus: wee haue no poſitiue example in Scripture that Chriſt ſhould baptize ſom tymes by

ſprinkling the Body with water, ſometymes by one total immerſion, and yet wee confeſs, that Baptiſm may be adminiſtred any of theſe three wayes, as the Church shall ordain; wee haue no poſitiue example that Chriſt should haue giuen the Eucharist, ſometymes in Leuen, ſometymes in Azim bread; and yet the Church may giue it in either: and hauing a poſitiue example that he gaue the Sacrament once in bread and wyne, and once, at leaſt, in bread alone, why cannot wee conclude that the Church may do ſo alſo. Chriſt gaue the Sacrament at night; is it therefore it cannot be giuen in the morning? Chriſt gaue it after the corporal repaſt; is it therefore it cannot be receiued faſting? Chriſt washed his Apoſtles feet when he gaue it, is it therefore needfull to wash the receiuers feet?

That *non obſtante* of the Council of Conſtance that ſo much ſurpriſes poore M. Sall, as if the Council had been preſumptious in prohibiting the vſe of the Chalice, hauing confeſſed that Chriſt and the Apoſtles gaue it to the faithfull, argues nothing of preſumption; for as the Council knew that Chriſt and the Apoſtles gaue the Cup to the Layty, ſo it knew alſo that ſometymes they

gaue only the Bread, and therby did vnderstand that it was left in the power of the Church to giue the Sacrament in either of both kinds. Vpon this ground did the Councel of Constance, and does the Church now prohibit the Chalice, iuſt reaſons mouing them to it. Firſt, that if the Cup should be giuen, that would hinder the frequent Communion, to which the Church doth exhort vs much; for where the wine is ſcant and deere, and the Communicants thouſands in number; the expences would be great: ſecondly People would conceiue a horror againſt the Communion, if they were obliged to drink out of the ſame Cup with ſickly Perſons, perhaps with contagious diſeaſes. Thirdly, the Communion would be morally impoſſible to many, that can not endure the taſt of wyne. Fourthly the danger of the effuſion of ſome drops in a great multitude of Communicants, theſe and many other reaſons haue moued the Church to command the vſe of the bread alone.

Heere indeed comes very pertinently, M. Salls argument againſt the real Preſence. The Communion vnder both kinds is not needfull, neither for the verifying of Chriſts words in the inſtitution of the Sa-

crament, nor for the effects, which by it are conueyed vnto vs: not for the effects conueyed, wheras what Christ promised to the Receiuers of the *bread* and *Cup*, he promises to the Receiuers of the *bread* alone. *He that eats this bread shall liue for euer*, Io. 6. 38. which he repeats three tymes in that chap. is not this all that is promised to the Receiuers of the Bread and Cup? not for the verifying of Christ his words, for that text Io. 6. (which is the strongest that our aduersaryes can alleadge) *if you do not eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood you shall not haue lyfe in you*. The particle *and*, which seems to require the taking of the Cup, as well as the bread, Bellar. l. 4. de Euch. c. 25. and Suar. in 3. par. disp. 71. sect. 2. do manifestly proue that it must be vnderstood *disiunctiuly*, and signify *or*, and the sence of the text is, *if you do eat the flesh of the son of Man or drink his blood, &c.* And that in the Hebrew or Syriach language, (wherin Christ did speake) it signifyes so, and that the Apostle S. Iohn writing in Greek, retained the Hebrew Phrase, Now that the particle *and* which vsually is *Copulatiue*, somtymes in Scripture signifyes *disiunctiuly*, they proue it by seueral examples of Scripture, as when S. Peter was

asked an alms Act. 3. he answered, *I haue no syluer and Gold*, meaning that he had neither syluer *nor* Gold, otherwise the excuse was friuolous. Ex. 15. and 21. *He that will kill his Father and Mother, let him dye*, the sence is *Father or Mother*, Psal. 1. *the impious shall not ryse in iudgment, and the sinners in the Councell of the Iust.* The sence is *nor the sinners.* So in that text *if you do not eat the flesh of the son of Man, and drink his blood, &c.* The word *and*, must be taken in a disiunctiue sence, and signify, *he that will not eat his flesh nor drink his blood*; which is declared by Christ his subsequent words, *He that eats this bread, shall liue for euer*; signifying, that eating alone, and consequently, or drinking alone was sufficient.

But say you Christ Mat. 26. after giuing the bread, and commanding to *Eat*, gaue the Cup and said, *drink ye all of this.* If the Apostles only, were commanded to *drink*, they only were commanded to *eat*, and so as the Layty is excluded from *drinking*, they must be also excluded from *eating*: and if the command of *eating* did reach to the Layty, the command also of *drinking* did extend to them.

For to answer this Obiection, you must obserue the difference betwixt a *sacrifice*,

and a *Sacrament*: a ſacrifice is a worſhip of God by the oblation of ſome viſible thing which wee offer in homage of his greatneſs; ſo that a ſacrifice is directed *to* God, and conſiſts in an *Action* exhibited to his honour. A *Sacrament* is a ſenſible ſigne giuen *to* a Creature for ſome ſpiritual inuiſible effect: ſo that the Nature of a Sacrament conſiſts in the *Reception* of a viſible ſigne by Gods Creatures, and is directed *to* them for a ſpiritual effect. The Euchariſt is a *Sacrifice*, a *Sacrament*. Its a ſacrifice of Chriſts body and blood vnder the Accidents of bread and wyne, offered to God in repreſentation of Chriſts body ſacrificed on the Croſs, and that the repreſentation ſhould be full and compleat, it was ordained in bread to ſignify his body broken for vs, and in the liquid ſpecies of wyne to repreſent his blood effuſed. This ſacrifice is offered not only by the Prieſt, and for the Prieſts that conſecrats but *by* and *for* the whole congregation; but becauſe each Perſon of the multitude is not the immediat Miniſter of the ſacrifice, but all do offer it by the hands of conſecrated Perſons, on whom Chriſt layd the command of ſacrificing, *Do this in commemoration of me*, commanding them to do, as then

he did; it is not need full that each particular of the congregation should receiue, either the *bread* or the *wyne* consecrated, as it is a sacrifice; but that the immediat Minister who offers it for all, should receiue both. Hence I confess that Christ in the institution of this Sacrifice in the last supper, directed his commands of *eating* and *drinking* only to the Apostles and their successors, which he then consecrated Ministers of the Sacrifice; and that neither the word *Drink* nor *eat* in those texts extend to oblige the Layty.

But the Eucharist is also a Sacrament, for that very body and blood of Christ, which he ordained to be a sacrifice to God vnder the accidents of bread and wyne, he ordained them to be giuen vnder the same Accidents to man for the spiritual nourishment of his soule. I say *vnder the same Accidents*, not that both kind of Accidents of *bread* and *wyne* are needfull for the perfect receiuing of a Sacrament but *either*; for the Eucharist in the Accidents of bread alone, is a sensible sign containing the body and blood of Christ, which nourishes the soul and giues lyfe euerlasting, *He that eats this bread shall liue for euer* therefore its a perfect Sacrament: whence I conclude, that since it is giuen to

Creatures as a *Sacrament*, and not as a *Sacrifice*, its sufficient they receiue vnder the sensible signs either of bread alone or wyne alone; for in either its a perfect Sacrament; and only in both a perfect Sacrifice. If you ask where then (if not in the words of the last supper) was there any obligation layd on vs to receiue the Eucharist Sacramentally? I answer, Io. 6. if you do not eat the flesh of the son of Man, &c.

Mr Sall concludes, that by Suarez his confession, 3. p. disp. 42. s. 1. the Accidents of bread and wyne are the constitutes of the Sacrament: consequently by taking away the Cup, wee deprive the Layty of the Sacrament. Suarez sayes, that the Accidents of bread and wyne, and either of *bread* or *wyne*, are constituts of the Sacrament, and throughout the whole disput. 71. largely proues in three sections that the whole essence of the Sacrament is contained in either kind.

Worshipp of Images.

Mr Sall sayes the worship of Images is expresly prohibited in the 20. Chap. Ex. which text also expresly prohibits *the making of grauen Images, or the lykness of any thing*

thing that is in heauen aboue, and on the earth, or vnder the earth or in the waters, and then adds in a distinct verse *thou shalt not adore nor worship them*. If Mr Sall will admit no interpretation of that text, but vnderstand it literally, the Protestants are also transgressors, who make pictures of the King, Queen and seuerall other things, and yet the text prohibits the *making of the likenes of any thing*. If he will interpret the text to signify, *no image must be made to be adored*, wee say the text does not only prohibit the *adoring* of them, but the *making* of them, if notwithstanding he will still insist vpon his interpretation, then he must giue vs also leaue to giue our interpretation, which is, that God prohibited Images to be adored as Gods, or as the representations of false Gods (which are properly Idols) and then enters the question which of both interpretations, his, or ours, is the true one, which none can decide but an infallible liuing Iudge, to which wee both must be bound to submit.

That God did no prohibit the making of Images, or the lykenes of things Diuine and Human (as the letter of the text sounds) our aduersaries must confess, for

he commanded the *Ark of the Teſtament* should be made Ex. 25. the *Braſen Serpent* to be ſet vp. Num. 21. which Chriſt ſayes, (Io. 3.) was a repreſentation of himſelf; That he did not prohibit all manner of worship and adoration of Images repreſentations, and lykneſs of things, which are in heauen aboue and earth, its alſo manifeſt; for he commanded the Braſen Serpent to be ſet vp, that the people looking on it, should be healed; and though Mr *Sall* would perſwade vs, that no adoration was to be giuen to it, yet certainly none can deny, but; *That looking on it*, was with an inward reuerence and veneration, as on an inſtrument of Gods mercies to them: and *Adoration* or *worship* conſiſts properly, in the inward *affection* of the mind. Beſides, the Ark of the Teſtament, which Caluin himſelf, *ſuper Pſal.* 105. confeſſes to be an image of God *Arca erat imago Dei* was ſtill religiously worshipped by the Iews, none permitted to touch it but conſecrated perſons, carried often in Proceſſion by Dauid, *Reg.* 4. 3. *Reg.* 8. and *Ioſue* 6. adored by Ioſue and the Iſraelits proſtrated on the ground before it; *Ioſue* 7. 6. But what the Proteſtants will neuer anſwer; that the Lords ſupper

is a representation of Christ his passion, a figure of his Body and is religiously worshipped by them, if they do what S. Paul requires 1. Corin. 11. 28. by this wee see, that the text must not be vnderstood literally, prohiting all worship, but prohibiting to be worshipped as Gods, the world being then plunged in Idolatry, some adoring the very statues and Images as Gods, others adoring the statues and images, as the pictures of seuerall things which they believed to be Gods, as *Iupiter Venus &c.*

Azor, sayes he, *instit. Mor. to. 1. l. 9. c. 6. declares it to be the constant iudgment of Diuins, that the Image is to be honored with the same worship wherewith that is worshipped, whereof it is an Image.* Azor has no such words, and you add falsly that it is our constant Tenet. Our Doctrin is declared by the 7. Gen. Council which is Nicen. 2. (and after by Trent and others) that Council decrees Images must be adored, and, does not determin how that adoration must be called, but only excludes the *Adoration of Latria*, which is that, which wee giue to God. The Diuins after this Council dispute, what adoration is it that must be exhibited to them: some say

only a *Relatiue*, others, an *Absolut* Adoration, some saye an Adoration of *Latria improperly* and for Gods sake, to whome only a proper *Latria* is due; and these that speake of this *improper Latria*, are checkt by others, because though by schollastical subtilities they may be vnderstood in a Catholick sense, yet that expression sounds harsh to pious eares, and generally all Diuins do censure any that should out of the schoole propose those subtilities to vulgar eares. But what they all agree in, and wee believe, that they must not be adored with that Adoration, wherwith God is adored, and wee all say with *Epiph.* who was present at that Nicen Councill: Act. 6. *non indignas habemus imagines honore veneratione at salutatione, debitamque adorationem illis dare debemus, siue igitur* (*obserue* these words) *placebit adorationem, siue salutationem appellare; idem erit, modo sciamus excludi Latriam; hæc enim est alia, à simplici adoratione. vvee iudge Images vvorthy of honor and adoration, and vvee ought to exhibit it to them: call that adoration as you please, so it be not Latria, its all alyke vvhat you call it: for Latria is different from an ordinary and simple adoration.* Let some particular Diuins therefore dis-

courſe as they pleaſe, its not our obligation to excuſe them, wee believe with the Church an Adoration, but no *Latria*.

Petauius, ſayes he, *a great Antiquary, declares, that for the four firſt Centuries there was little or no vſe of Images, in the Oratoryes of Chriſtians*; I cannot imagin, to what purpoſe does Mr *Sall* bring theſe quotations of Petauius, Azor, Iacobus de Graffys, if it be not to let his Auditorie or Reader know, that he is verſed in Authors. This proues that the Primitiue Church, did vſe Images, though not ſo much as now they do: and Petauius giues in that very place Dogm: Theol. to 5. l. 15. cap. 13. the reaſon, why they were not more frequently vſed; becauſe the world conuerted from Paganiſm, that believed in ſtocks and ſtones, and ſome of them, that their *Gods* were *Bodyes* and not pure *Spirits*; to ſhun the occaſion of a relaps into theſe errours, and to withdraw the people from any apprehenſions of *Corporality* in God, Images were but little vſed, nay in ſome places where the danger was greater they were abſolutly prohibited; and Sanderus l. 2. *de cultu imaginum* c. 4. ſayes this was the reaſon why the Coun-

cil of *Elibert* prohibited the vſe of Images. S. *Gregory*, whoſe words you cite, would haue the people, kept from an Idolatrous worship of Images and pretended no more. Not only *Nichephorus Calixtus*, but many this day of the Catholick Church do hold it abſurd to paint Images of the *Father*, *ſon* and *Holy Ghoſt*, as they are in their proper ſubſtance and Nature; nor does the Catholicks vſe it as you falsly criminat them, but they paint the *Father* in the form of an Ancient Man, as he appeared to the Prophet Daniel, the *ſon* in human shape, and the *Holy Ghoſt* in the figure of a Doue as he appeared in the Riuer Iordan.

Vaſquez ſpeaks not a word of Images in the place cited by you 3. p. diſp. 94. but 3. p. Diſp. 103. 5. 4. he ſayes Images alſo, as well as Idols, are prohibited in the firſt Commandment: and what then? Vaſquez was miſtaken as well as you: but you far more; for he ſayes in that place, it was not becauſe the adoration of Images was in it ſelf naught, as you ſay; for you ſay its Idolatry; but becauſe it was obnoxious in thoſe tymes to the danger of falling into Idolatry; and therefore prohibited: but this danger ceaſing (as in the

Law of Grace, Images may and ought to be adored, and not prohibited by that commandment: if he ſpeaks conſequently or no its not my buſineſs to examine it. You ſay God commanded the Braſen ſerpent to be broken, becauſe the people worshiped it: 2. Reg. 13. 4. but the text will inform you well, if you ſet preiudice aſyde, that they began to adore it for God, as they did the molten Calf: and therefore it was prohibited. You ſay our people commits many diſorders in adoring Images; y deny any ſuch abuſes that may reach to Idolatry: and that the Authority which God has giuen to gouern vs, and which wee are bond to obey, is to take cogniſance of that, which when they do, and prohibit Images, wee will obey them; in the mean tyme wee will giue you and your Church leaue to bark at the Moon.

But I muſt mind you of one miſtake for to conclude this diſcourſe, Clemens Alexandrinus, ſay you, Hom. 7. (I pray where haue yow ſeen, or any other, Homilies of Clemens Alexandrinus? but this is not the miſtake that Iam to aduertiſe you of) and in his Paræneſis, ſpeaking of Images in general declareth thus: *wee haue no Images in the world, it is apparently forbid-*

den to vs, to exercyse that deceitfull art for it is vvritten &c. you are miſtaken Mr *Sall*, and it cannot be but maliciously, if you haue read his *Parænesis*, for he does not ſpeake of Images *in general*, but of Idols, and ſuch as were adored for Gods by the Gentiles, to whom he directed that *Parænesis* diſſwading them from Idolatry, to the worship of one true God. This is a matter of fact, let the Reader peruſe the Author himſelf, and he will find that you are miſtaken.

Hence wee conclude that Images of Chriſt and his ſaints cannot be called *Idols*. For an *Idol* is a repreſentation of a God that is not, or a *Deyty* that has no being; Images of Chriſt and the ſaints are repreſentations of things that haue a real *Being*: and to ſay that Chriſt his image is an *Idol*, is to ſay, that Chriſt, who is the Prototype has no real *Being*. wee conclude that the making of Images was neuer prohibited; for God made man to his own Image, commanded many Images to be made, the Ark of the Teſtament, the Braſen ſerpent, and ſeueral others mentioned in Scripture: and the Proteſtants themſelues make many Images of Kings, Queens, and ſaints. wee conclude, that all worship to

Images is not prohibited for wee worship the King particularly, becauſe he repreſents Gods Power and greatneſs; nor all *religious* worship of Images is prohibited, for wee giue a Religious worship to the Holy name of *Ieſus*, to the Bible beyond all other Books, becauſe it is the word of God, and the Proteſtants to the Sacrament, which they ſay is but a figure of Chriſts body: Reaſon proues wee ought to worship the Images of Chriſt and his ſaints; for it is apparent, that there is ſuch a relation and connexion, betwixt the image and the thing wherof it is an image, that the honor or deshonor don to the image for being a repreſentation of the Prototype, is eſteemed to be don to the Prototype: as when a man is by publick iuſtice burnt in *Effigie* his perſon is branded by the execution don in his image, and no man but will think the iniury don to his picture, an affront to his own perſon. wee therefore muſt worship the Images of Chriſt and the ſaints, becauſe they are their repreſentations, and in this vndoubtedly wee worship them, for the relation and connection that is betwixt the repreſentation and thing repreſented: this worship reſteth not in the Image, but paſſes to the Prototype

for whose sake wee worship it. And therefore it may be called a *transitiue*, or *relatiue* worship; The adoration of *Latria* due to God wee deny to Images, and detest it as much as you: and when wee declare our Doctrin and Faith so cleerly, its malice and knowen preiudice, to accuse vs of Idolatry, which consists in adoring as God, what is not God.

Inuocation of Saints.

Mr Sall I hope does not forget that Maxim of the schooles, *argumentum multum probans nihil probat*, that an argument which proues more than the disputant pretends, or can pretend to proue, proues nothing, but must be fallacious; and doubtless any Christian will say that an argument that proues directly against the Scripture, is but a Sophistry. Let vs heare his argument against the Inuocation of Saints. God sayes he Rom. 8. 34. has appointed his son Iesus to make intercession for vs, who is more compassionat, better able, and more willing than any Saint or Angel to helpe vs, and his prayers are efficacious; for, sayeth he, Io. 5. 16. *Whatsoeuer vve ask the Heauenly Father in his name, he vvill giue it vs.*

This argument proues directly against Scripture, for it proues that wee must not ask the Saints on earth to pray for vs, nay it proues wee must not pray for ourselues, but remit all to Christ, who knowes our wants, is more compassionat towards vs than the Saints on earth are, nay than wee are of ourselues; loues vs better than they loue vs, or wee loue ourselues, is better able, and more willing to help vs, than they are, and than wee are ourselues; on the other syde his prayers are more efficacious, why then should wee ask the prayers of Saints on earth, or pray for ourselues. Yet Scripture commands vs to pray for ourselues, and recommends vnto vs, that wee should ask the prayer of our Brethren, and the Protestant Church also does practice it. Therefore this argument proues directly against the Scripture and against the practice of the faithfull.

Its certain Christ loues vs better, than the Saints or Angels do, and is more able and willing; but it is also certain, that he loues the Saints of heauen, better than he loues vs; poore sinners on earth, (I know not what opinion Mr Sall may haue of himself) and so what he would not do for vs on earth, for our sakes, wee may expect,

he may do it for the ſake of thoſe that he loues moſt, which are the Saints and Angels in heauen. For wee haue examples in Scripture of ſome Bleſſings conferred on the liuing on earth, not for the ſake of any liuing on earth, but of Saints departed. 3. Reg. 11. 13. God ſhewen mercy to Salamon, in differring the punishment which he deſerued for his Idolatry, not for Salamons ſake, but for Dauid his Fathers ſake, (who was dead) 4. Reg. 19. 34. God protected Ieruſalem againſt the Aſſyrians, nor for Ezechias the Kings ſake, though he loued him; nor for Iſaias his ſake that then liued, and was a Holy Prophet, but *for his owne ſake and Dauids ſake his ſeruant.* Thus wee ſee, that though God loues vs more than the Saints departed loue vs, yet he loues them more than vs, and giues vs for their ſake what he would not grant vs for our own.

He brings the words of S. Peter Act. 4. 12. that there is no ſaluation in any other, and no other Name vnder Heauen, wherby wee may be ſaued; all which wee acknowledge, and yet Proteſtants as well as wee do aſk the prayers of their Brethren on earth; and why may not wee aske the prayers of the Saints in heauen? for what

wee expect by their interceſſion, and the value and worth of their prayers, is altogether grounded, and ſprings from the Merits of that name of Ieſus. This is all that Mr Sall alleadges againſt this Tenet of ours; iugde you what ſtrong conſiderations moued him to deſert our Church. He ads the folly of two Spanish fryers that beyond all meaſure, *euen of the Catholik Principles*, as he grants, pag. 75. exceeded in the prayſes of Saints, and he would be no longer a Catholick, ſince there were ſuch madmen amongſt vs, and perhaps ſome Proteſtants will haue the lyke encouragement for to leaue that Church, ſince Mr Sall is entred into their Congregation. But if, by your acknowledgment, theſe exceſſes are againſt our Principles; therefore you grant, that our Principles do not wrrant any exceſſes in the Inuocation of Saints; why therefore did you leaue the Church, whoſe Principles are ſound? becauſe ſome fryers played the foole? a pretty reaſon.

Now that I haue anſwered your obiections M. Sall; y pray anſwer me to this diſcourſe; that the Saints in Heauen do pray for vs, I proue it thus; and, if I be not miſtaken, euidently in the Principles of Religion.

The Saints in Heauen know euidently that there is a Militant Church on earth; for they euidently know that the Resurrection or general Iudgment is not as yet come; whereas they know that they haue not assumed their Bodies; consequently they know the world is not ended, and that there is a militant Church on earth. Also they know euidently that this militant Church is in continual warfare, still assaulted by Satan with temptations, beset with spiritual dangers: for this is the *Essence* of a *Militant* Church; and in this it is distinguished from the *Triomphant*; that *This*, is out of all danger; *That* is in continual battle: by this it appeares that the Saints in Heauen, are not altogether ignorant of our affaires on earth, as our Aduersaries would haue them to be. Now I proceed in my discourse, can it be imagined that the Saints in Heauen, knowing our temptations, and battles with so fierce an enemy as Satan, should be so deuoid of Charity, as not to pray for vs? I know not what you may answer, but I know what some answer: that they can not pray; for, being rauish'd with the possession of an accomplisht Bliss, they cannot mind any thing els, but the glory of the obiect which they

ſee. But this is incredible, that the Deuils in the bitterneſs of their torments should not forget vs, nor the hight of miſeries should not allay their malice, but ſtill tempt vs; and the ſaints and Angels should abate their Charity in the greatneſs of their glory: ſpecially that Chriſt (ſayes S. Paul Rom. 8.) prayes inceſſantly for vs; the poſſeſſion therefore of the glory, cannot hinder the ſaints prayers for vs.

But I proue that their glory obliges them to pray for vs: you cannot deny, but that in the poſſeſſion of that glory, they ardently deſire, the exaltation of Gods name, the increaſe of his glory, the confuſion of his enemy Satan; and what greater confuſion of Satan, what greater exaltation of Gods name and glory, than the victory of men againſt Satan, the victory of thoſe that are tempted by him, and finally mens ſaluation; vndoubtedly then, wheras they euidently know that the Militant Church is in continual battle againſt that enemy, in continual temptations, and dangers of damnation; the very poſſeſſion of that glory makes them deſire ardently, and wish our victoryes, and ſaluation: this wish and deſire of theirs, you cannot deny but that it is manifeſt to God; and what

els, I ask you, is a Prayer, but *a pious desire of a thing, represented to God?* it is euident therefore that the saints and Angels pray for vs to God.

This discourse, you will say, proues that the triumphant Church, and each particular of it, knows the wants of the Militant Church in general, but not of each particular, or of any particular person of the Militant Church, therefore wee particular Persons ought not to pray to any of the Triumphant Church, wheras they do not know if wee pray, or any of our particular affairs.

But the argument proues at least that the saints departed and Angels are Mediatours for the Militant Church in general; and so all Mr Salls discourse, for the only Mediatourship of Christ, falls to ground: moreouer I will proue by Scripture and reason that they know the temptations, and dangers of particular Persons of the Militant Church and consequently the former discourse proues, that they pray for particular persons, and heare their prayers.

Lu. 15. its said that the Angels reioyce at (and consequently know) the conuersion of a sinner; the Deuils know the state and condition of particular persons, and by their

their temptations allures them to ſin: the glorious Spirits therefore, who in their natural knowledge are equal to, and in ſupernatural ſurpaſſe them, do know no leſs, neither is it credible that God ſhould permit the Deuil to know mans condition to tempt him, and ſhould not permit the glorious Spirits, eſpecially our Angels keepers to help and defends vs: the Proteſtants ought not to queſtion this; wheras in their Common Prayer Book, they haue this Collect on S. Michael the Archangels day the 29. of Sept: *God vvho in a vvonderfull manner diſpenſeths the Miniſteries of Men and Angels, grant, that as they do thee conſtantly aſsiſt in heauen, ſo by thy appointment, they may ſuccour and defend vs on earth.* God therefore vſeth the Miniſtery of Angels to help men, and conſequently Angels know mens particular affairs. That there are witches in the world may not be denyed, if wee will not condemn moſt Commonwealths of folly and iniuſtice, which punish many for ſuch, and if wee will not laugh at Scripture which relates 1. Reg. 28. that Saul by the help of a witch rayſed the Spirit of Samuel, that the witchs inuoke and are heard by the Deuils its out of doubt; and ſhall the Glorious Spirits be

deaf to them that inuoke them? laſtly many examples are recorded in Scripture of the miniſtery exhibited by Angels to men. 3. 19. 6. Reg. 1. Gen. 48. 16. and 16. 4. Reg. 19. 34.

And that ſaints alſo departed know our affairs and do aſſiſt vs, the Scripture doth witneſs it: Saul, all fraught with afflictions, finding no comfort in the liuing, betooke himſelf to the Spirit of Samuel deceaſed, 1. Reg. 28. this proues that men in thoſe dayes did belieue that the ſaints *departed* know our affairs, and can help vs, and Samuels anſwer to him does euidence the ſame. Elias departed this world, thats to ſay all commerce with human kind, the 18. yeare of Ioſaphas Reygn, as appears 3. Reg. 22. and 4. Reg. 2. and 3. Ioſaphat dyed about ſeauen years after, which was the 25. yeare of his reygn, as appears 3. Reg. 22. Ioram ſucceeded to Ioſaphat, and Elias that departed from all human commerce ſeauen years before, writ a letter to him, rebuking him for his wickedneſs, and threatning him with Gods indignation. can there be amore manifeſt proof that the ſaints departed know our affairs, and do help vs? S. Peter 2. epiſt. c. 1. tells the Chriſtians to whom he writ, that his death was

at hand, and that he would be mindfull of them after his departure from lyfe, and help them to be mindfull of his Doctrin.

Can it then be doubted but that wee may prudently, and ought to pray to them, by whose means the Scripture assures vs that others did receiue Gods blessings? either directing our prayers immediatly to God, praying that for his B. Mothers sake, for S. Peters sake, for Dauids sake (this prayer is often made by the ancient Prophets in Scripture, *Propter Dauid seruum tuum non auertas faciem Christi tui.* Psal. 131. *Memento Domine Dauid & omnis mansuetudinis eius.* ps. 131.) he would haue compassion of vs? or directing our prayers immediatly to the saints and Angels, beseeching them to help vs, and pray for vs; as Iacob Gen. 48. prayed that God, in whose sight he walked, and the Angel, who deliuered him from euils, should bless his children. This is it that's vnderstood in that Article of our Creed, *The communion of saints*, that the saints of the *Triumphant* Church in heauen, of the *Militant* on earth, and the *Patient* in Purgatory, haue a Communication of prayers and merits betwixt them, that those of heauen pray

for vs, and wee by our prayers and ſuffrages, do help them in Purgatory.

Mr *Sall* thinks it extrauagancy, that wee call the B. virgen our *Sauioreſs* and *Redeemer*; and if he be impartial he muſt call the Prophet Dauid extrauagant alſo, when he ſayes (ſpeaking of the ſaints) *Pſal.* 81. *I haue ſaid, ye are Gods, and the ſons of the higheſt all:* And perhaps he will not ſtick to blame God himſelf, who ſayes to Moyſes Ex. 7. 1. *behold I haue made thee a God to Pharaoh?* wee call the B. V. ſo, becauſe thoſe names may be giuen in an improper ſence to the chief Inſtrument of our Redemption, as she was, being the Mother of him who is truely our Redeemer. wee build more Churches ſayes Mr Sall, and ſay more prayers to ſom ſaints than to God: wee anſwear that all the honor we exhibit to ſaints is giuen to God, for whoſe ſake we honor them. To them we build Churchs for his ſake becauſe they are his great ſeruants. He aſſures vs in the Ghospel that what wee do to one of his *little ones* wee do it to him; much more wee may be aſſured, wee do to him and for him, what wee do to, and for his ſaints in heauen, wheras himſelf tells vs, Io. 12 26. *if any will ſerue me,*

my Father will honor him. Much more ought they to be honored by vs.

Purgatory and Indulgences.

Mr Sall rallyes about the ſituation of Purgatory and the nature of the torments that there are ſuffered, if *cold, heat, rain, & tempeſt* &c all which is to no purpoſe, for what is controuerted betwixt Proteſtants and Catholicks is not, what place is Purgatory in, or what are the payns inflicted there; but if there be any ſuch thing as Purgatory: the Proteſtants deny any third receptacle of ſouls departed, but muſt go either to heauen or Hell, for *vvhere the tree falls, there it remayns.* The orthodox Doctrin is that there is a Purgatory, where ſouls departed with *venial ſins* only, or that after the remiſſion of their mortal ſins in this lyfe by the Sacrament of Confeſſion, or by an act of *Contrition*, haue not don ſufficient pennance in this lyfe for their tranſgreſſions; muſt ſuffer vntill they ſatisfy Gods iuſtice to the *laſt farthing.* This is an Article of Faith; but the Church has not determined in what place is Purgatory; that is a ſchoole queſtion: as for the Nature of the torments there inflicted; its an Article of Faith that they are tormented with the priuation, or banishment

ſrom Gods ſight: alſo its of Faith that they are tormented by fyre: but the Church has not determined, what kind of fyre is that, or how it torments; and though Diuins and Fathers ſpeake of other torments, yet its no Article of Faith, that they ſuffer this or that, of Cold, ſnow or tempeſt.

To proue our Catholick Tenet, I will firſt proue; that there is ſome other receptacle of Souls departed beſids Heauen and Hell of the Damned; ſecondly I will proue that there is a Purgatory.

The firſt is proued by the Article of our Creed, *he deſcended into hell*, which cannot be vnderſtood to be the Hell of the damned, for all Chriſtians abhorr the blaſphemy of Caluin that ſayes Chriſt his ſoule ſuffered the payns of the damned: the Proteſtants giue a moſt obſcure interpretation to that cleer text; by the word *Hell*, ſay they, is vnderſtood the *Graue* and the ſenſe of the Article is, that Chriſt his Body deſcended into the graue. This is moſt abſurd, for in the next word before this Article, the deſcent of his Body to the Graue is expresly declared, *He was crucified, dead, and buried*: to be buried what elſs is it, but his Body to deſcend

into the Graue? and after telling vs in the word *buried*, that his Body was put in the graue, would they again repeat the same in a distinct Article, when they pretended to giue vs a brief abridgment of the article of Faith?

S. Peter expounds that Article, 1. ep. 3. 19. *Being dead in flesh, he descended in Spirit, to the Spirits that were detained in prison, to preach to them that were incredulous in the dayes of Noe.* Behold the Article of our Creed expounded; *his Spirit descended after his death*, surely it did not descend into the graue) *to the Spirits that were detained in prison*; (there was a prison therefore, where Spirits were detained;) and *preached to them*, (certainly he did not preach to them that were in the prison of the damned;) therefore there was some other prison besids that of the damned, where spirits were detained.

Wee find Gen. 37. 35. that Iacob perswaded by his children that his son Ioseph was killed, and deuoured by a Beast, lamented and said, *I will descend mourning vnto my sonne to Hell.* Certainly he did not intend to descend vnto him to the graue, for he was perswaded he had none, but was deuoured by a Beast; neither can it be ima-

gined that he intended to descend vnto him, to the Hell of the damned, or believed that his son descended thither; Iacob therefore believed that there was an other Hell, where his son descended, and he expected to goe after his death. This shocks the whole fabrick of the Protestant doctrin, of *no Purgatory*; grounded chiefly on the perswasion of no other receptacle of souls, but Heauen and Hell of the damned.

Now that there is a Purgatory, I proue it: the Protestants deny it, because that if the sin be forgiuen in this lyfe, then all the punishment due of man for that sin is also forgiuen, and so there is no Purgatory: if the sin was not forgiuen, then it carries the soul to Hell, for in the other world no sin is forgiuen. But I proue that though the sin be forgiuen by the Sacrament, or Contrition, yet some temporal punishment is due of the sinner to God, to satisfy his iustice, is it not the dayly practice of Preachers, to exhort sinners, euen the reconciled sinners, to do pennance, for their sins? what pennance did not Magdalen do, euen after that Christ had told her, that her sins were forgiuen? what great pennance did not Dauid, S. Peter, and other reconciled sinners do? this shews that the Faithfull were allways perswaded that pennance must

be don, though the ſin be forgiuen: and it is noaſwer to ſay, that theſe auſterityes practiſed by them were not for the ſins they committed, and were forgiuen; but for to arm them againſt future temptations; for wee haue many paſſages of Scripture which shews punishments inflicted by God on the reconcilied ſinners, for their ſinns, after they were forgiuen.

For example original ſin is forgiuen by Baptiſm, yet the corporal death, which is a punishment inflicted on mankind for that ſin, as S. Paul ſayes Rom. 6. and 5. is not forgiuen, but inflicted on all. The Prophet Nathan declared to Dauid that his ſin of Adultery was forgiuen him, yet in punishment of that ſin, the Child got by that Adultery, should dye. 2. Reg. 12 Iask, was that puuishment iuſtly due of Dauid after his ſin was forgiuen or no? If not, why should God inflict it for that ſin? if it was due; let vs ſuppoſe that Dauid had dyed before that punishment was inflicted, (which might haue happened, and dayly happens to others; who dye before they do any pennance for the ſins that by the Sacrament were forgiuen) ſurely he muſt haue paid that debt in the other lyfe, before he could enter into Heauen; where

no foul, guilty of any thing, can enter. Therefore there muſt be ſome other place where ſinners, whoſe ſins haue been forgiuen, and that haue not don ſufficient pennance in lyfe muſt be punished in the other world. A Priſon I ſay where the laſt farthing may be paid, and that being paid, the priſonner may get out, for our Sauiour mentions ſuch a priſon after this lyfe. Mat. 5. and Luc. 12. but the laſt farthing cannot be paid in the Hell of the damned, for the debt is due there, for *Eternity*; therefore there muſt be ſome other priſon for ſouls departed beſids the Hell of the damned.

Now if you read Mr Salls diſcourſe vpon this ſubject, you shall not find that he brings any text of Scripture, that as much as ſeemingly ſayes there is no Purgatory; and yet the Reformers did ſeparate themſelus from the Church of Rome, wherof they were members, vpon pretext of errours (wherof Purgatory is one) which they would proue by cleer Scripture to be errours, and contrary to Gods written word: and not one text does Mr Sall, nor can he bring any cleer text to proue *no Purgatory*; much leſs will you find any euident, or conuincing reaſon in his diſcourſe to impugn our Tenet: what he does is to

anſwer ſom texts (the chief he ſayes, but he is miſtaken) wher with Bellarmin proues it, and giues only Bellarmins own anſwers, and thus he would perſwade vs out of our Doctrin.

But firſt allow thoſe texts that Bellarmin brings, do not conuince the exiſtence of a Purgatory; allow that texts which I heere alleadge, do not manifeſtly proue it: This, no man of iudgment will deny, but that theſe texts and gloſſes vpon them, haue as much probability, as much appearance of truth, as any that you bring or can bring againſt Purgatory; that your anſwers to thoſe texts are not euidently true, for they are Bellarmins own anſwers, for the moſt part at leaſt, and he reiects them very plauſibly, ſince therefore wee were for ſo many ages in the actual belief of the doctrin, before you and your Reformers came to the world, why ſhall wee be bet from it, if you cannot shew ſtronger reaſons or texts againſt it, than wee haue for it. Nay though wee brought no reaſons at all to proue our doctrin, but this that we receiued it as the word of God from ſo many precedent ages; is it reaſon that for you, or your Reformers pleaſure, without a conuincing text or reaſon to proue it fal-

ſe, wee muſt diſclaim it: allow that thoſe texts do not cleerly proue Purgatory, thats nothing; wee are not *Actors* but *Defendants*, its not our obligation to proue, but yours; wee will defend ourſelues againſt your proofs, and ſo hold our old doctrin.

But now I proue that thoſe texts, which Mr Sall iudges inconcluſiue, do proue what Bellarmin intended the firſt is out of 2. Mach. 12. a collection being made, he ſent 12000. drachmas of ſyluer to Ieruſalem, to haue ſacrifice offered for the ſins of the dead becauſe he did conſider that theſe, who receiued death with piety, would haue a very good reward it is therefore a holy and holſom thought, to pray for the dead, that they may be deliuered from ſinns. This is the text though theſe Books were Canonical Scripture, ſayes he, yet the text proues not Purgatory, for prayers for the dead, may be made for other ends, than that of drawing ſouls out of Purgatory; firſt becauſe that God being ſtill preſent to all ſpaces of Eternity, foreſeeing now, what prayers will be made many years and ages hence, for perſons that are now, at this preſent, dying, and being a good Paymaſter that oftentyms gives before hand, the rewards of what ſeruices

will be don for the future, may now giue to the perſon dying the aſſiſtance of his grace and mercy, which he foreſees will be in future tymes asked for them by friends that will pray for them: which Doctrin, ſayes he, is taught by the Romish writers, and acording to this Doctrin wee may ſay, that the effect of thoſe prayers made for the Iewes by *Iudas Machabeus*, was not do draw them out of Purgatory after thy were dead, but that God should haue giuen them for reward of thoſe prayers a Good death.

Obſerue, Reader, what is it that Bellarmin intended to proue by that argument, l. 1. de Purg. c. 3. §. *ad ſextum dico* he ſpeaks thus. Our conſequence proceeds not thus: *they prayed for the slain; therefore there is Purgatory*: but thus. *They praied for the remiſsion of the ſins of the dead*: therefore they iudged, that after their death they might be in Purgatory; that they might after death haue ſome ſins that needed expiation: and this praying for the dead, to deliuer them from ſin after their death, is commended by Scripture: conſequently ſins may be forgiuin after death, conſequently there is a Purgatory after death, otherwyſe the Scripture would haue erred

in prayſing, prayers for the remiſſion of the ſins of the dead. And what man of common ſenſe does not ſee, that theſe concluſions follow out of that text, For what Bellarmin pretended and wee pretend to proue out of that paſſage, is that it was the practice of the Iewish Church, and the belief of the People of God (and conſequently no new inuention of the Catholick Church) that ſins may be expiated and forgiuen after death and that prayers were vſed to be made for the dead, not only for to prayſe God, for the reſt of the Faithfull departed, nor for the mutual comfort of the liuing in the death of our friend, nor for our ſpiritual inſtruction reflecting on our own mortality at the ſight of death, but as this text expresly ſayes, *for the ſins of the dead, that the dead may be deliuered from their ſins.*

That ſubtility of the Catholick Doctors alleadged by Mr Sall, that God foreſeeing the prayers that will be made, may, as a good Paymaſter, pay before hand, is very good, but is not to the purpoſe: for allow thoſe prayers made for the ſlain might haue had that effect in this paſſage, but ſtill returns the concluſion, pretended by Bellarmin, that the paſſage proues it was

the belief and practice of the People of God, and prayſed by Scripture, to pray for the expiation of the ſins of the dead. Moreouer it might, and does, lykely, happen that ſome dye for whom no prayers are or will be made after death, which our foreknowing God cannot reward before hand, becauſe they are not in *Being* nor will not; if thoſe men dye in venial ſin, or without hauing don ſufficient pennance, there muſt be a Purgatory for them, conſequently that ſubtility proues not the *non Exiſtence* of a Purgatory.

Again, ſayes he, that paſſage, though true, proues not Purgatory, becauſe thoſe Men dyed in mortal ſin, wheras they were found to haue vnder their coats things conſecrated to the Idols. (As the text relates (nor is it true, ſayes he, what Bellarmin ſayes, that their ſin was only venial, becauſe it deſerued Gods vengeance and their death: as if a venial ſin, did not deſerue that punishment. Neither does Bellarmin ſay abſolutly it was but a venial ſin, but that *perhaps* it was no more, becauſe it was committed through ignorance, or though it might be mortal, yet at the hour of death, eſpecially dying for ſo pious and glorious a cauſe, they might ha-

ue obtained of God an act of contrition. And whereas Iudas Machabæus did not know certainly that they were guilty of Mortal sin, he might haue prayed for them.

He alleadges other considerations why prayers might be made for the dead, though there were no Purgatory, first for to prayse God for the rest giuen to the departed, secondly for our mutual comfort in the death of our friend, thirdly for our instruction to mind vs of our mortality, and sayes that when in Ancient Authors wee meet prayers to be made for the dead, wee must vnderstand, they were made for these ends, and not for the drawing of souls out of Purgatory. wee confess that those considerations are very good, and that they were practised by the Ancient Church (as those words of the Commentaryes vpon Iob, futhered on Origen relat) and are still practised, but wee deny that these are the onely considerations for praying for the dead but also for the remission of their sins, as the former text doth euidence; for their ease and deliuery from the payns they suffer after death: and in the Ancient Fathers wee meet (contrary to what Mr Sall auers) prayers for the dead to be made for this end; nothing more

frequent

frequent: two examples only I will produce: S. Denis, Disciple of S. Paul Apostle, l. de Eccl. Hierar. c. 7. p. 3. *the venerable Bishop approaching prayes for the dead, and that prayer beseecheth the Diuine Clemency, that he may forgiue to the dead, all the sins that through humane fraylty he committed: and that he may place him in the light, and region of the liuing.* Isidorus l. 1. de off. Diu, c. 18. *if the Catholick Church did not beliene that sins are forgiuen to the Faithfull departed, it vvould neither make alms, nor offer sacrifice to God for their souls.* This is the vnanimous Doctrin of all antiquity, to all which Mr Sall will answer with Caluin, Gchinus and Peter Martyr that the Ancient Fathers erred: and this is all the answer wee can expect.

He values nothing the text out of Tobias 4. alleadged by Bellarmin, yet it proues cleerly what Bellarmin pretended, that it was the practice of the People of God, to offer alms for the dead. The words *fyre* and *vvater* (sayes he) in the ps. 66. 12. *vvee passed through fyre and vvater, but thou broughtest vs out into a vvealthy place.* signify tribulations and crosses of this lyfe, and so that text proues nothing of Purgatory. Bellarmin aknowledges, it might be thus

interpreted, and in other ſenſes, but ſayes Bellarmin, *Origen Hom. 25. in Num. and S. Ambroſe ſer. 3. in Pſal. underſtand by water Baptiſm, and by fire Purgatory.* And you, Mr Sall, should haue told vs, what you thought of Origen and S. Ambroſe his interpretation. You will ſay what your Predeceſſors of the Reformation haue ſaid, that they erred.

Bellarmin brings the words of Chriſt Mat. 12. that *a ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, ſhall not be pardoned in this world nor in the world to come.* And ſayes that S Auguſtin, S. Greg. Beda, and S. Bernard, draw from this text a conſequence that ſome ſins are pardonable in the other world, nay that this was the only text wherwith S Bernard did proue Purgatory. M Sall ſayes that conſequence does not follow, becauſe, ſayeth he, (he taketh this reaſon from Peter Martyr) a poſitiue does not follow out of a negatiue as from ſaying, *the Duke of venice is not Earl of Dublin*, it follows not, *therefore ſome other is Earl of Dublin.* See you Reader, which interpretation you lyke beſt if you will chooſe to ſtick to Mr Sall, and Peter Martyr, or to S. Auguſtin, S. Greg. Bede, and S. Bernard. His example is friuolous. For it were a ridiculous

propoſition to ſay, *the Duke of Venice is not Earle of Dublin*, if there were not a Dublin extant wherof ſome one may be Earl; ſo it were ridiculous to ſay, *this ſin ſhall not be forgiuen in the other vvorld itſelf*: if there were not an other, world where ſins may be forgiuen; therefore wee ſay, that either wee muſt acknowledge ſins to be pardonable in the other world, or Chriſt his words to be ſence leſs: as it were a ſence leſs aſſertion, to ſay, *pride ſhall not be punished in this vvorld, nor in Heauen.* When all the world is perſwaded before hand, that Heauen is no place of punishment for pride or any other vice. So wee alſo grant, that were wee to conſider the letter only of the text; out of the words of the Euangeliſt, Matt. 1. 25. wee ought to conclude that Ioſeph knew Marie after her Childbirth; but the Scripture interpreted by the Church expounds vnto vs by ſeueral other texts the ſence of that text not to be, as the letter founds; and Mary to haue remayned a Virgen continually; and ſo you bring that text to no purpoſe.

Now Mr Sall I will proue, that not only acording to the rule of Prudence, but alſo acording to the rules of Faith and Logick, the conſequence of Purgatory is manifeſtly

euinc'd out of that text: Thus ſayes the text: *He that vvill ſpeake a vvord againſt the ſon of Man, it ſhall be forgiuen him; but he that vvill ſpeake againſt the H. G. it ſhall not be forgiuen him, either in this vvorld, nor in future.* I argue thus: the text denies to a blaſphemy againſt the H. G. what it grants to a blaſphemy againſt the ſon of Man. But what it denies to *That*, is remiſſion in this lyfe and the other: therefore what it grants to *This* is remiſſion in this lyfe, and the other: The text ſayes again in this place, *Euery ſin and blaſphemy ſhall be forgiuen to men, but a blaſphemy againſt the H. G.* Is it not an euident ſequele out this text, that as a blaſphemy againſt the Spirit is vnpardonable, ſo all other ſins are pardonable; but a blaſphemy againſt the Spirit is vnpardonable in this world, and in the future; therefore other ſins are pardonable in both.

You will reply, that this argument proues too much; for it proues that as a blaſphemy againſt the H. G. is vnpardonable in the other lyfe, not only as to the *punishment*, due to the ſin, but alſo as to the *guilt*, or *fault*; ſo other ſins are pardonable in the other lyfe, not only as to the *punishment* due to ſin, which is what wee pretend; but alſo as to the *fault* or *guilt* of ſin, which is

more than wee pretend; for wee teach that Mortal ſins are not forgiuen as to the *guilt* or *fault*, in the other world: therefore this argument proues too much. Anſwer: that a ſin may be ſaid *vnpardonable*, its requiſit that *Nothing* of it be pardonable; for, as the ſchoole Maxim ſayes *Negatio totum deſtruit*: wheras therefore the text imports, that a blaſphemy, againſt the H. G. is *vnpardonable* in this lyfe and the future, it follows, that nothing either the *guilt* or *fault* of it, or *the punishment* due to it, be pardoned, either in this lyfe or the future. But that a ſin may be ſaid *pardonable* it ſuffices that ſome part of it at leaſt may be pardoned; wheras therefore our argument proues, that ſins are pardonable in the other lyfe, its requiſit that ſome part of it be pardoned or pardonable in the other lyfe; either the *guilt* of ſin, or the *punishment* due to it: Not the *guilt* or *fault*; as wee believe and proue by many euident arguments: therefore the *punishment* due to it.

He tells vs the doctrin of Purgatory makes men negligent of true repentance, and ſatisfaction for their ſins in this lyfe, for the hopes it giues of the Remiſſion of them in Pugatory. But this is incredible, that men

being instructed of the bitternes' of the torments of Purgatory, far exceeding all that can be suffered in this world, should be encouraged to omit the smale pennance and pains of this lyfe, for to suffer the far greater and more excessiue pains of Purgatory. It giues (quoth he) occasion to pittifull abuses of *Simony* in the valuation of *Masses*, of cruelty and iniustice: and what is there in the world so sacred and Holy, but the malice of man may abuse? is it therefore all sacred things must be renounced and abolisht? wee condemn the abuses as well as you; but wee must not therefore condemn the Doctrin, but correct the malice of man that abuses it.

From this of Purgatory he descends to exclaim against Indulgences; which he pretends to be groundles becaus Suarez, *l. de Defen. fid. c.* 15. sayes that Indulgences is a remission of the pains of Purgatory, and most falsly auers that Suarez doubts, if this power be in the Church, wheras in that place he affirms it is vndoubtedly certain the Church has it, and grounds this certainty on the infinitnes of Christs Merits, which euen our Aduersaries grant, and on the power giuen to the Church, Mat. 18. 18. of binding and vnbinding; which power

ſayes he, cannot be doubted, but it extends to the Remiſſion of the pains of Purgatory; for which in that place he brings no other proof, but the conſtant practice of the Church, which he ſayes is an vnqueſtionable proof; and remits the more ample proof of this doctrin to *To. 4. in 3. p. diſp.* 48.

M *Sal'* iudges the doctrin not ſufficiently proued, becauſe Suarez alleadges in this place no other warrant but the ancient cuſtom of the Church, which Suarez and wee hold to be an vndoubted proof; This proof and no other does S Auguſtin bring to proue Infants Baptiſm, ſerm. 4. *de verbis Apoſt. c.* 18. *This, the Authority of our Mother the Church hath, againſt this ſtrenght, againſt this inuincible vvall, vvhoſoeuer rusheth, ſhall be crushed in peeces.* By the ſame he proues the validity of Hereticks Baptiſm, l. 1. contr Creſcon. c. 32. and 33. for which, he ſayes, *No examples is brought out of Canonical Scripture, but that vvhich recommends vnto vs the Authority of the Church, vvho teacheth it.* S. Chryſoſt. vpon the words of S. Pauls 2. Theſ. 2. *Stand and hold the Traditions, &c.* Hom. 4. ſpeaks thus: *Let vs account the Tradition of the Church vvorthy of belief: it is a Tradition ſeeke no more.* And again S. Auguſt.

Epist. 118. *If the Church through out the whole world practise a thing; to dispute, whether such a thing can be don; is a most insolent madnes.* I conclude then that Suarez sufficiently proued the truth of the doctrin of Indulgences, hauing grounded it on the constant practise and custom of the Vniuersal Church.

You say the doctrin of Indulgence is not so Ancient: and that the first who began to giue these Grants was *Gregory* the seauenth, to the Emperour *Henry* the fourth to encourage him and the Christians to warr against the Sarazens; as Baronius relates an. Dom 1084. if all this were true; its older notwithstanding than Protestancy by many hundred years: But if you haue no more skill in Diuinity or Moral Theology, (your Treatise shews well what you know in Controuersy) than you seeme to haue in History, you are but a fresh water scholler. That Indulgence you speake of, nor no other to any such purpose, was not granted by *Gregory* the seauenth, but by *Vrban* the second; nor to *Henry* the fourth, who made no warr against the Sarazens, but to *Henry* the Third; not in the yeare 1084. but 1095. Neither is this the first grant of Indulgences which you could meet, if you had read the Histories; Baronius related by

you, tells vs that Indulgences were granted by Leo the third the yeare 847. and by *Iohn* the Eight the yeare 878. Nor is it a good argument ; *wve do not read that Indulgences vvere giuen before ; therefore the Power of granting Indulgences vvas not in the Church before.*

You add that priuat Bishops granted Indulgences for gathering of Monies to build Churches ; that is very true, but if *Noſtre-Dame* of *Paris* was built vpon that account, is not ſo certain : by that you may ſee Indulgences are not ſo slightly granted as your Miniſters do perſwade their flock ; but on Condition that the Receiuers endeauor to put them ſelues in the ſtate of Grace by true repentance of their ſins, and that they exercyſe ſome pious works of faſting, Prayers, Alms, deeds, and ſuch others as they, who giue the Indulgence, require : and that the Alms which are enioyned in ſuch caſes (though by the malice of ſome they may be turned to ſiniſter vſes) are deſigned for pious vſes. You mention ſome words of the 92. Canon of the Council of Lateran, vnder Innocent the Third, and that Council has but 70. Canon in all, nor does the Council ſpeake any thing in any Canon of In-

dulgences, its no new practice of your fraternity, to coyn new Canons and texts as you want them.

You cite S. *Thom.* and S. *Bonaven.* who relate, some were of opinion, that *indulgences* were but a pious fraud of the Church to draw men to charitable Acts; its true those saints relate that opinion; but relate not who were the Authors of it; but only *that some did say so*, and they condemn it as impious, and iniurious to the Church. S. Bon. in 4. dist. 20. q. 6. *sed hoc est Ecclesiæ derogare, dicendo eam sub specie mentiri, quod abhorret mens recta.* Thus you only proue by this argument that there were some impious people that accus'd the Church of being a cheat. And do not you do the lyke? wee embrace most willingly the aduertisment of Bellar de amiss: Gratiæ l. 6. which you relate (but nothing to your purpose) that in things depending of the freewill of God, wee must affirm nothing but what he has reuealed in his Holy Scripture; but you are mistaken in asserting that God has not reuealed the Doctrin of Indulgence in the Scripture, for that text Mat. 18. 18. *whatsoeuer ye shall vnbind on earth, shall be vnbinded in Heauen* signifyes the Power of vnbinding from

thepains of Purgatory ; you ſay it does not; and you cite *Durandus* and *Maior*, who ſay it does not, and that Indulgences are not found expresly in Scripture ; but I ſay that though they be not expresly found in ſcripture, they are implicitly found there ; and you confeſs in the beginning of your diſcourſe that wee are bound to belieue not only what is contained in Scripture, but the vndeniable conſequences out of it ; out of that text, the power of vntying from the pains due to ſin, is an vndeninable conſequence ; the Church declares it and interprets the text ſo ; to whoſe Authority *Dur.* and *Maior* muſt yeild. And though there were no text in Scripture, that either explicitly or implicitly did import Indulgences in particular ; yet by Scripture it ſelf wee are bound to belieue it, it being the Doctrin of the Church, as S. Auguſt : ſaid of Hereticks Baptiſm l. 1. cont. Creſcon. c. 32. and 33. obſerue his words, which comes very appoſitly to our preſent ſubiect : *Although verily there be brought no example for this Point* (he means the validity of Heretick Baptiſm, for which he ſayes there is no text in Scripture) *yet euen in this Point the truth of the ſame Scripture is held by vs, vvhile vvee do that, vvhich*

the Authority of Scripture doth recommend vnto vs: that ſo, becauſe the Holy Scripture cannot deceiue vs, vvho ſoeuer is afraid to be deceiued by the obſcurity of this queſtion, muſt haue recourſe to the Church Cõcerning it, vvhich vvithout ambiguity the Holy Scripture doth recommend vnto vs. By which ſentence of S. Auguſtin, you find that wee follow Scripture whylſt wee follow the Doctrin of the Church, which the Scripture commands vs to heare and obey.

You will perhaps infer out of this diſcourſe a conſequence, which may ſeem to you abſurd, thus: therefore wee are bound to belieue as an Article of Faith, what Doctrin the Church propoſeth to vs, though that point in particular be not contained either explicitly or implicitly in any text of Scripture, only vpon the teſtimony of the Church: This conſequence is true: and the reaſon is; that the Church, being Gods infallible Oracle, cãnot propoſe to vs as a reuealed Truth but only that Doctrin, which truly is reuealed by God: God reuealed all Truths of Religion to the Apoſtles as wee haue diſcourſed in the 6. Chap. the Apoſtles deliuered all thoſe truths to the Church, to be handed from age to age to Poſterity; the Apoſtles did not deliuer all

thoſe Truths in writing, as wee haue diſcourſed in the 2. and 3. ch. but part in writing, and this is *Scripture*, part by vnwritten Tradition, and this is the *Depoſitum* that S. Paul ſpeaks of to Timothie, the Church is the keeper of this *Depoſitum*, and as by the Scripture wee know what written Truths the Apoſtles deliuered; ſo by the Church wee know aſſuredly what vnwritten Truths they deliuered. Now wee ſay that the Church cannot propoſe to vs as a reuealed Truth, but what was deliuered by the Apoſtles (who doubtleſs knew and taught to their Diſciples all truths of Religion) to the Church, for wee do not ſay nor beliene, that the Church can coyn new Articles of Faith, but only deliuer the Old, that, through careleſsneſs, came to be confuſedly knowen, and almoſt forgotten; wee do not pretend that the Church has new reuelations of new Doctrin, which God did not deliuer to his Apoſtles, but that she has the aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit to know certainly, and find out the truths that were formerly reuealed and taught by the Apoſtles, not only in writing but by word of mouth. what truths therefore the Church propoſes vnto vs, wee are obliged to belieue them as re-

uealed truths, though they be not in Scripture particularly mentioned; for if they be not there, they were taught verbally by the Apostles, they are of Apostolical tradition, and if the tradition be obscure or doubtfull, the declaration of the Church renders it certain. Thus it matters not that Indulgence is not expressed, nay nor implicitly contained in Scripture; if it be not, it must of necessity haue been taught verbally by the Apostles, since that the Church proposeth this Doctrin as a reuealed Truth, and no truth is a reuealed truth, but has been reuealed to them, and by them deliuered vnto their Disciples.

Publick Prayer in an vnknovven Language.

Ex ore tuo te iudico ſerue nequam: your own position is the strongest argument I can alleadge for Publick seruice in an vnknowen language: you say thus: *the purpoſe of Nature by ſpeakiug is to communicat the ſenſe of him that ſpeaketh to the hearer; but hovv can that be if the hearer perceiueth not the meaning of the vvords he ſpeaketh.* Therefore wee must speake in a knowen language. I ask, to whom do wee

ſpeake in the Liturgy, or Publick ſeruice of the Church? Sure its not to the congregation, but God: its to him wee direct our Prayers, for to prayſe him, and implore his Mercy. The Hearer is God properly, and not the Congregation; and therefore where there is no Congregation preſent, the Pſalms are ſung in the Qyre and Publick ſeruice don: if therefore wee communicat our ſence (when wee ſay Maſs or publick ſeruice) to God, who is the hearer wee ſatisfy the purpoſe that Nature intends by ſpeaking, and wheras God vnderſtands our ſence in whatsoeuer language wee ſpeake though vnknowen to the Congregation; wee may ſay the publick Prayer in a language vnknowen to them.

Is not Prayer, ſay you, (you ſee how your arguments recoyls againſt yourſelf) a raiſing vp of our minds to God to prayſe him or ask fauors of him? will it not be conducent and neceſſary for this to vnderſtand the Pſalms and Prayers? But Sr do you think it neceſſary that a Polander, who preſents a Petition to the King of England in the English language, ought to be blamed, becauſe he does not himſelf vnderſtand that language? or is it not enough for his purpoſe, that the King doth vnder-

ſtand it? cannot he prudently rely in the Faith and honeſty of the Notary or Clerk that writ it, who being inſtructed of what he pretends giues him the petition drawen to be preſented? If therefore Prayers, by your acknowledgment, are but our requeſt to God for the obtaining of his Mercy, is it not ſufficient for me that he vnderſtands them? and may not I rely on the Faith, and honeſty of the Church, who giues me theſe Prayers, as ſo many petitions wherin my requeſt is contained?

You bring a text of S. Paul 1. Cor. 14. 17. againſt this Tenet, and you will not haue vs to conſider the obiect or end to which he directed his diſcourſe; but the reaſons and inſtances he alleadges: as if his reaſons, or any mans reaſons, could be of force to proue any thing, but in relation to the obiect, or ſubiect of his diſcourſe. To the contrary, for to vnderſtand the Apoſtles reaſon in the genuin ſence, wee muſt obſerue to what end he directed his diſcourſe, and the ſubiect he treated of; and no vnpreiudiced man will reade that Chapter, but will manifeſtly preceiue that he did not ſpeake of Prayers to God, but of preaching and inſtruction of the congregation, which he ſome tymes in

that

that Chap. calls *Prayer*, but the context shews plainly, that what he meanes is *Exhortation*, or *instruction* of the people: for all along he disproues that *Praying* or *speaking* in an vnknowen language, and giues for reason, because the *Hearers* did not vnderstand it; does not this reason apparently proue that he meant what was spoken vnto the people, which was what wee now call *Sermon* or *exhortation*? For S. Paul could not condemn Prayers made to God in an vnknowen language, and giues that for reason, *because the Hearers did not vnderstand it*: for the *Hearer* of the Prayers made to God, are not the people but God, to whom the prayer is made, and of him, S. Paul could not say, that he did not vnderstand: therefore he could not condemn speaking to him in an vnknowen language.

To be brief, I propose this syllogism. S. Paul in that Chap. condemned speaking in a language that the Hearers could not vnderstand, this is euident out of the text. But in the publick Prayer of the Church, wee only speake to God, he only is the Hearer of those Prayers, for to him they are made and directed and not to the people, and he can vnderstand in any language: therefore S. Paul did not condemn the publick Prayer

of the Church in any language. Again S. Paul condemned ſpeaking in an vnknowen language, that the Hearers, to whom one did ſpeake, did not vndeſtand: But in the Church nothing is ſpoken to the people, but what is preached, or taught by exhortations, ſermons, expoſition of the Ghoſpell, &c. then, and only then, the Congregation are the *Hearers*: therefore what S. Paul condemned was preaching exhorting, or expounding the Ghoſpell vnto the people in vnknowen languages, becauſe then the Hearers could not vnderſtand what was ſpoken to them.

He tells vs what great bleſſings the Proteſtants enioye by hauing the Publick ſeruice in Common language, how much it conduces for the increaſe of deuotion and how vnhappy the Catholicks are in wanting this comfort; but, alas, wee haue but too great an experience of the contrary; that the putting the Lyturgy in common language, has cauſed the decay of deuotion, the contempt of the publick ſeruice, the deſreſpect of ſacred things ſullyed by euery Coblers mouth; your men of vnderſtanding and zeale are ſufficiently ſenſible of this, and would wish that theſe ſacred things were kept at a diſtance from the common people.

The words of S. Auguſtin, *l.* 4. *de doctr. Chriſt. c.* 10. that he thinks do fauor him, proues what wee teach, *vvhat profiteth any excellency of ſpeech, if not vnderſtood by the Hearer?* (when wee pray, God is the *Hearer*, and he vnderſtands any language: and when wee preach or exhort, the congregation is the *Hearers*, and muſt ſpeake to them in the language they vnderſtand) *No cauſe being for ſpeaking, if vvhat vve ſpeake be not vnderſtood by them, for vvhoſe ſake vvee ſpeake, that they may vnderſtand vvhat vvee ſpeake.* Could he ſpeake in plainer terms of a preacher? to let him vnderſtand that he muſt preach in the language that his Auditory vnderſtands.

The Antiquity of their practice (of praying in the Latin language) *goes thus*, ſayes he: and when I expected he ſhould tell vs when it began; (for this would be to declare the *Antiquity*) he bids that task farewell, and only tells vs the motiue and cauſe why it was introduced; not becauſe the Latin or Greek were more Holy than other languages, but becauſe they were more vniuerſally vnderſtood: and do you approue that reaſon? if not why do not you ſay ſom what againſt it; if you do? why therefore do you check the practice?

Now let vs briefly shew the lawfullneſs of praying in an vnknowen language, (I ſay the Publick Prayer of the Church as for priuat prayers, its confeſſedly lawfull and commendable to pray in vulgar language) and the neceſſity of it. The Lawfullneſs is proued The Iewish Church had their Publick ſeruice in the Hebrew language, which was not vnderſtood by the People, the common language was the ſyriak: And Chriſt hauing aſſiſted ſomtymes at their Publick ſeruice, as wee find in the Ghospell, though he reprehended often the abuſes of that Church, neuer did he reprehend this, by what wee may gather out of the Euangeliſts: nay he publickly approued it for when he hung on the Croſs exercyſing the function of a High Prieſt in the ſacrifice of his lyfe for mankind he prayd publickly *Eli Eli Lammaſabacthani* which being Hebrew, was ſo far from being vnderſtood by the people, that they thought he called for Elias. Therefore it is lawfull in the publick Sacrifice and Lyturgy of the Church to pray in an vnknowen language. Moreouer its not neceſſary that the people vnderſtand the Prieſt or Miniſter who prayes, as the publick Miniſter of the Church, for the Congrega-

tion: how many of your Congregation that do not vnderſtand agreat part of your pſalms, though they be in vulgar language? many Phraſes of them being ſo hard and obſcure, that the learned Men muſt haue the help of Interpreters to find out their true meaning: And the Deaf, and ſuch that are at ſo great a diſtance that they cannot heare, do not they reape any benefit by your publick Prayers becauſe they cannot vnderſtand what is ſaid? And if a Hugonot of France came to Dublin, who did not vnderſtand your language, would not you admit him to your Communion and publick ſeruice? by this you ſee its lawfull of its ſelf, to make publick Prayer in an vnkwnowen language.

You will ſay, and I believe the Proteſtant Church will pretend no more, that it is not ſo conuenient for the edification of the people; but more needfull, it ſhould be in the language that is commonly vſed. To this I anſwer that the Publick Prayer of the Church may be in any language which is thought the moſt conuenient for the glory of God, and ſpiritual profit of the flock; but I ſay alſo, that it is not you, or I, or this, or that kingdom or Prouince muſt be the iudge to determin in which

language is it moſt conuenient it should be; God has giuen vs a Church who will gouern vs, its to her it belongs to iudge what Rites, Ceremonies, and manner of Diuin worship wee muſt practiſe, and as the particular ſubiects of each Kingdom, cannot queſtion the Cuſtoms, Lawes, or Decrees of the Gouernment, ſo the Chriſtian Kingdoms and Prouinces muſt not queſtion, nor iudge of the conueniency of what Rites or practice the Church does eſtablish; let vs ſuppoſe that in relation to this kingdom of Ireland, it might be thought, and realy may be ſomwhat more aduantagious for the flock, to haue the Publick ſeruice in English or Irish, is it therefore it muſt be lawfull for this kingdom, without the approbation of the Church or ſuprem Paſtor of it, to vſurp that practice? no, but you are to repreſent that conueniency to the Church, and acquieſce to her reſolution. But ſay you why would the Church of Rome ſtick on ſo inconſiderable a thing as that; but rather than to be a cauſe of Schiſm or ſeparation, grant the publick ſeruice may be in vulgar language? and I ask alſo, why would not you, or this Prouince, or that rather be content to want that particular comfort

which you propoſe to yourſelf in doing this or that which is not conformable to the approued practice of the Church, rather than to run in deſobedience againſt the Church whoſe command and Authority, is a ſufficient warrant for you to allay what ſcruples your reaſon may ſuggeſt againſt it? The Church ought not to condeſcend with you, and diſpenſe with you in the obſeruance of the publick practice and Ceremonies, though they be but Eccleſiaſtical and humane inſtitutions: for if it shoud grant you lycence to ſay Maſs in English, why should it not grant France leaue to Communicat in both kinds, if France did ask it: and if Spaine did ask to Chriſtean with three immerſions of the Body and not otherwyſe why should not the Church grant it; and if Germany did ask the validity of Clandeſtin Marriages, why should it be denyed; and ſo (each Kingdom, deſiring their reſpectiue priuiledge) the vniformity in Diuin ſeruice, Adminiſtration of Sacraments, and Eccleſiaſtical Rites ſo much commended in the Church, would be quite ouerthrowen.

Its the Church therefore muſt iudge and determin in what language is it moſt conuenient to worship God by Publick Pra-

yers; and wee are to acquiesce to the Decree and commands of the Church. And therfore *Luther*, who vnder pretence of greater conueniency and spiritual comfort of the congregation condemned Publick seruice, in vulgar languages, against the practice of the Church; schismatically separated himself from her; in which separation you continue by adhering to his Doctrin.

The Church established Publick seruice in the Latin language; behold why? because it is the common language of the Church: as in respect of England English is the common language, and spanish in respect of spaine; so in relation to the Church spred throughout all Nations, the Latin is the most vniuersal and common. Therefore it was conuenient the Publick Prayer of the Church, which is said in all parts, should be in the publick and most vniuersall language which is the Latin. And as each kingdom has a language proper to it self, so the Church which is the kingdom of Christ, has its proper language which is Latin; which is so vniuersally knowen. Secondly for to preserue vniformity in the manner of Diuin worship; if the Mass had been in English three hun-

dred yeare agon, how different would the Maſs be now from what it was then? the language being wholy an other, from what then is was: doubtleſs, it would haue cauſed great alteration in the publick ſeruice. Thirdly if the Maſs were not in Latin or ſom language vniuerſally knowen throughout the world, but in the particular language of each kingdom, when Prieſts would come from their own Countries to ours in Pilgrimage, (or for other occaſion,) they would not be premitted, (or not without great difficultie) to ſay Maſs, and ſo would be depriued of that ſpiritual Comfort.

Scripture prohibited.

I pray S^r what do your People learn in their houſes by reading the Bible? is it not Rebellion againſt their Church, and contempt of all Spiritual Authority, each one obſtinatly adhering to that ſenſe, of the text which he iudgeth the beſt, and thus your Church is deuided into a numberleſs number of ſects? this is ſmale encouragement for vs to permit to our common people the vſe of the Bible, iudging it better to *knovv to ſobriety*, as S. Paul

counſels, than, by pretending to know more than behoueth, to run into thoſe inconueniencies, wherin you haue fallen. You accuſe the Catholick Church for expoſing Images to the adoration of the flock, for the danger of falling into Idolatry; and this is the reaſon that Caluin alſo giues: you haue liued many years in Spain, where Images are in great veneration: you haue been much acquainted with the Inquiſition, as you would haue vs beleeue; you know the ſeuerity of that Tribunal againſt Hereticks, Iewes and Idolaters; how many haue you ſeen in Spain, that by adoring Images came to fall into Idolatry? doubtleſs had there been any, the Inquiſition would haue taken holt of him; for though the Inquiſition permits Images, it would neuer leaue Idolatry, occaſioned by the adoration of Images, vnpunished. And not one, I dare ſay, did you euer ſee, or heare of, to haue been punished on this account.

Now conſider, how many haue fallen into Hereſies, and errours quite oppoſit euen to your Church, by the liberty granted for reading of Scripture; hence has proceeding all the Sects that are in our kingdoms and elswhere. Does not this

demonstrat, that there is far greater danger of Heresy in the vsual reading of the Bible, than of Idolatry in adoring of Images? ought not you rather therefore, to decry the liberty of reading the Bible, than the adoration of Images?

But, reply you, this proues that euen the Priests and fryers ought to be kept from reading it, for its they that haue abused it, and broached all heresies: and things must not be prohibited (that are in themselues good) because they are abused but the Abusers must be punished: And this good consideration, Mr Sall, will not perswade you to admit the vse of Images: wee grant Mr Sall that principle to be good, that things in themselues commendable, must not be prohibited, because they are abused; when the vse of then is absoluty needfull, or conuenient; and the abuses are not very frequent and pernicious; as in this case of reading the Bible, its not needfull, nor can it be proued to be very profitable for the common people; on the other syde the abuses are most apparent, frequent, and pernicious; for thence comes all these sects and heresies; therefore it ought to be prohibited: but Mr Sall, you must mind, what I aduertised you in my discourse of Prayers,

in an vnknowen language, that it is not you or I nor any other, but the Church, that must iudge of the conueniency or inconueniency, the aduantage or desaduantage of reading of Scripture; she must declare that, and acording what she iudges, who is constantly directed by Gods infallible Spirit in the gouernment of the flock, must permit or prohibit it.

This, your Church will not say, that the vulgar people are bound in conscience to read the Scripture; for many cannot reade any thing; others do not read all Scripture, nor do they think that they sin, by not reading; others do neuer read any thing of it: what you can iustly pretend is, that it is conuenient and profitable, and therefore ought to be permitted: and heere returns what I discourſed of Praying in an vnknowen tongue. Let any vnpreiudic'd man iudge if it does not belong to the Church to determin, what is conuenient, or most conuenient; since that God has giuen a Church to gouern vs? Let any man iudge, if a particular man, that against the establisht authority, vnder which he liues, and is bound to obey; should rise against that authority and make himself iudge of what is conuenient or inconuenient for

the gouernment, and vnder pretence of a greater conueniency that appears to him, should alter the eſtablished practices of the Commonwealth, should not ſuch a man, I ſay, be eſteemed a ſeditious Reuolter, and be punished? what therefore shall wee ſay of *Luther*? he liued vnder the authority of the Catholick Church; he was a priuat perſon, he found the vſe of the Bible prohibited, and publik ſeruice in Latin; he did not pretend that it was abſolutly neceſſary for ſaluation, to pray in knowen languages; nor to reade the Bible; but iudged it to be moſt conuenient, and therefore condemned the Church for prohibiting it; is not this man to be eſteemed a ſchiſmatick; that oppoſes himſelf to the publick authority, and makes himſelf iudge of the practices eſtablished by it? and muſt not wee rang you with him that perſiſts in the ſame rebellion?

Prieſts and fryers haue abuſed Scripture, its very true; but for one that has, thouſands haue not, and for one of the vulgar that has not, many haue: beſids prieſts and fryers, being the Paſtors of the Church, are obliged to reade, and when a Prieſt or fryer abuſes the Scripture, its eaſy to punish him; but when a multitude of popular

people abuſes it, the remedy is not ſo neer at hand. He quotes vpon M. Stillingfleets word, a Council of Bishops at Bononia, that prohibited the Scripture giuing for reaſon that it diſcouers the corruptious of the Catholick Doctrin: but this Council muſt be of the ſame coyn of the 92 Canon of the Council of Lateran, which wee mentioned aboue, no ſuch Canon of Lateran or Council of Bononia is, or was extant, but in M. Stillingfleet and Salls imagination.

I conclude with theſe two Aſſertions: firſt its needfull that the Paſtors, Prelats, and Doctors of the Church do reade the Scripture, and that the flock receiue from them the ſence of it, and the Doctrin contained in it. Its for this end that God placed in his Church ſome *Prophets*, ſome *Apoſtles*, ſome *Euangeliſts*, *Doctors*, and *Paſtors*, to keepe vs in Vnity of Faith by teaching what wee ought to belieue S. Paul Eph. 4. Act. 20. 18. he commands the Paſtors to watch ouer the flock, in which the H. G. hath placed them to gouern the Church. Its therefore Chriſt laid his command on the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors, to teach all Nations, to preach the Ghoſpell: and therefore ſayes S. Baſil. q. 25. *Superiorum eſt iſta*

ſcire, &c. its the obligation of the Superiors (to ſay the Paſtors) to knovv and learn theſe thing, vvhich they may teach to others; but of the others, not to konovv more, than behoueth them to knovv. And Leo Pope writing to the Patriarck of Alexandria epiſt. 62. and epiſt. 82. ad Iul. *You muſt haue care that none, vvho is not a Prieſt of the Lord, may preſume to vſurp the authority of teaching or preaching, vvhether he be a Monk, or a layman though a learned man.* And S. Aug. l. 1. de moribus Eccl. c. 1. *vvhat man of iudgment doth not vnderſtand, that the expoſition of Scripture, is to be asked of them, vvho by their profeſſion are their Doctors.* And if to proceed wyſely, wee muſt conſult the Lawyers, for the true meaning of the Law, and that each Commonwealth hath men whoſe profeſſion it is to ſtudy it, and deliuer the true ſence of it, to thoſe that are not Lawyers by Profeſſion, how much more, it is needfull, that there be Doctors in the Church whoſe obligation is to ſtudy the Scripture, and find out by the Fathers and Interpreters the true ſence of it, and teach it to the people.

This and no more doth the authorities of Fathers produced by Mr Sall proue; the reading of Scripture is recommended vn-

to vs, ſayes he, by S. Baſil, S. Chryſoſt. and S. Auguſtin: its very true; but to whom? to the learned men of the Church, whoſe obligation it is to teach the Doctrin it contains, and to the Layty no further, than to hold that ſence of them, which the Paſtors deliuer to be the ſence of the Church.

The ſecond Aſſertion, that it is not conuenient, nor lawfull for the Layty to reade them further, than with a total ſubmiſſion of their Iudgment to the ſence giuen to them by the Church. This is manifeſtly proued by the multitude of ſects, wherin to the world is deuided through the liberty aſſumed of reading the Scriptures, and vnderſtanding them, as the Readers think beſt. Secondly by the obſcurity of Scripture which wee haue demonſtrated in the 2 and 3. ch. S. Peter, ſayes Mr *Sall.* 2. Epiſt. 1. 19. exhorts vs to read, *vvee haue alſo a ſure vvord of of Prophecy, vvherunto ye do vvell to take heed &c.* but S. Peter, *by that ſure vvord of Prophecy*, means, not only the written word of God, but alſo the vnwritten word, which is the Tradition, by which the Church deliuers to vs the true ſenſe of the written *vvord*; which he bids vs *to take heed of*. S. Paul recommends

commends vnto vs the reading of Scripture Rom. 15. and 2. Tim. 3. as being written for our comfort and instruction. That is not denied; but the Apostle speaks to Timothy, and the Pastors of the Church; and so of the rest of the texts alleadged by Mr Sall; which are directed only to the Pastors and Prelats, or at most to such of the Layty, as are knowing in the Fathers and Interpreters, with a total submission to the sence of the Church. For if euen the very learned themselues, are puzl'd with the difficulties of Scripture, and often do wrest them to their perdition as S. Peter sayes 2. Epis. 3. 16. what will the vulgar people do?

THE IMMACVLAT CONCEPTION of the B. Virgen; and the Sacrament of Confession.

IT's not my intention to discourse at large of the Immaculat Conception of the B. Virgen; but neither can I omit to speake somwhat of it, wheras Mr Sall in the Conclusion or Third part of his sermon, accuses our Church of Tyranny in forcing the belief of this Doctrin vpon the Faithfull; *they force them to the belief and*

defence of Doctrins repugnant to their Iudgment, and not eſtablisht by Catholick Faith; as may appear in their violence in forcing all to believe and declare for the Conception of the Virgen Mary vvithout Original ſin, ſo many clear teſtimonies of Scripture being againſt it, as affirm that all Men did ſin in Adam; that Chriſt vvas vniuerſal Redeemer from ſin, and Sauiour of all mankind. And purſues complaning that none is permitted to preach in Churchs, or receiue Degrees in vniuerſities, but ſuch as will proteſt publickly for the immaculat Conception.

I admire Mr Sall that you ſo confidently auerr that *many cleer teſtimonies of Scripture are againſt the immaculat Conception*, and mention none, what did you expect wee would believe a Bankrrupt in Religion only vpon his bare word? you should haue produced thoſe cleer teſtimonies; and if you call that a cleer teſtimonie againſt this Doctrin, which S. Paul has Rom. 5. *all haue ſinned in Adam*, as if the B. Virgen were alſo included in that vniuerſal Propoſition *All haue ſinned*; its rather a cleer teſtimony of your little inſight in Scripture, which if you had, you might know that very often ſuch vniuerſal Propoſitions, admit exceptions, becauſe they are not Lo-

gically *vniuersal* signifying euery *Indiuiduum* or Particular of the *kind*; but Morally *vniuersal* signifying the greatest part or number of the *kind*; That Proposition *All men haue sinned in Adam*, is true, because generally men did sin in Adam, though Christ who is a *Man*, nor Mary did not. wee could giue many instances of the lyke Propositions in Scripture, these will suffice; Christ Io. 10. saying himself was the true Pastor, ads; *all that euer came before me vvere theeues and Robbers, but the sheep did not hear them.* Does not this General Proposition admit no exception? was the Baptist, Moyses and Elias theeues and Robbers? when Iesus was in the house of Simon and Andrew, the text sayes, *they brought vnto him all that vvere diseased, and possessed vvith Diuils,* And in the next verse. *All the Citty vvas gathered together at the door.* what think you? was there none, Man, woman, nor child of the whole town but was there? it's morally certain some was absent, yet the Proposition is still true, because that vniuersall Proposition signifies that the Generality of the town flockt thither.

Christ you say is the *vniuersal Redeemer* from sin; whence you would infer, that

the Virgen Mary was in ſin, or could not be Redeemed: but you ignore, or affect to ignore that there are two manners, or wayes of redeeming; the one deliuering a man from the ſin wherinto he has fallen, the other preſeruing him from falling into the ſin. Marie was redeemed by the Merits of Chriſt from ſin, becauſe by his Merits she was preſerued from falling into ſin, wherinto she had fallen had she not been preſerued by him; and this is the moſt noble way of Redemption, as it is a greater benefit, to ſaue a man from being wounded, then to permit him to be wounded and afterward to cure him.

Now Mr Sall to shew you that our Church is not cruel in this Doctrin of the Immaculate Conception, I hope you will not ſay its a ſin to profeſs publickly that Doctrin, for at leaſt you cannot deny but that it is very probable, though it be not an article of Faith; as it is no ſin to profeſs publickly the Doctrin of the *Thomiſts*, or that of the *Scotiſts*: nor will you deny but that its lawfull to any Community to require certain conditions, ſuch as they think fit, ſo they be not vniuſt and ſinfull, from any that will pretend to be a member of that Community, or partake of

their fauors, or priuiledges; does not the Colledge of Dublin require ſom conditions from them that are to be admitted to their Community; and is it cruelty to deny them admittance if they will not embrace thoſe conditions? why then will you cenſure it to be cruel, that ſome vniuerſities will not admit to Degrees, nor Churchs admit to preach but thoſe that will proteſt for the Conception? why will not you alſo accuſe of cruelty ſome vniuerſities which will admit none to Degrees but ſuch as will profeſs and teach the Doctrin of *Thomiſt*? But ſay you they oblige men to proteſt for the Conception, againſt their Iudgment; and dare you to condemn this to be cruelty when the Church of England obliges to ſweare the ſpiritual ſupremacy of the King, which in opinion of Calvin (as I haue shewen aboue) is a Blaſphemy, in the iudgment of moſt learned Proteſtants is falſe, an in the opinion of Catholicks, which you oblige to ſweare, is an Hereſy? The opinion of the Immaculat Conception is not heretical, euen in the iudgment of thoſe who appoſe it; and when an opinion or Doctrin is not heretical, a Spiritual or Temporal Prince, or any Community may lawfully oblige their ſubiects, for

reason of state, and the peaceable gouern-ment of their People, to conform them-selues exteriourly and profess that Doctrin, leauing them the Liberty of iudging inte-riourly what they please: and such as ma-kes that exteriour profession its their part to correct their iudgment, and conform it to their exteriour profession, which they can lawfully do, when the Doctrin is not heretical or erroneous. why may not the vniuersities and Churchs exact the out-ward profession of the imaculat conceptiõ, which without heresy or error a man may inwardly iudge to be true? and why can the Protestant Church exact the swearing of the spiritual Supremacy of the King from them, who cannot in conscience submit their iudgment inwardly to that Doctrin?

In the Conclusion of his Sermon also M. Sall accuses our Church of cruelty in the exercyse of the Sacrament of Confes-sion. And I obserue that he does not con-demn the Doctrin of Confession which our Church belieues to be a Sacrament, ne-cessary for such as haue fallen into sin; per-haps he was conuinc'd to belieue the ne-cessity of it by that vnanswerable text Mat. 18. 18. *vvhat soeuer ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heauen, and vvhat soeuer ye*

shall looſe on earth, shall be looſed in heauen, which words are alſo expreſſed Mat. 16. 19. ſins therefore may be bound or vnbound on earth by the Apoſtles and ſucceſſors, and the text marks (obſerue well) that their *binding*, or *vnbinding on earth* by them, muſt precede to their *binding* and *vnbinding in Heauen*, whence the neceſſity of Confeſſion of ſins to the Prieſts is abſolutly concluded. But let vs ſee wherin are wee guilty of cruelty in the practiſe of Confeſſion.

Firſt, ſaies Mr Sall, *in obliging to the minut expreſſion of the moſt loathſom circumſtances of ſecret thoughts and deeds, which renders it the moſt heaute of Chriſtian duties.* The man would haue a pretty ſweet manner of Confeſſion, to declare what each one is pleaſed, and no more. How? the Proteſtants did hitherto accuſe vs that wee did facilitate ſin, and gaue and eaſy way for forgiuing it, by granting the Prieſt power of forgiuing and now M. Sall accuſes vs, that wee require too much? by this wee may ſee which of vs, Proteſtants or Catholicks, does encourage moſt to ſin by an eaſy forgiuing it: for the Proteſtant for to be reconciled from ſin requires no more but a *Lord haue mercy vpon me, for I am as ſinner*, and that

betwixt him and God: the Catholick requires the declaring of each particular sin and circumstance to a Priest, with an act of sorrow for having sinned, a firm purpose of amendment, the fullfilling the Pennance that the Priest shall enioyne, and the restitution of what he has taken from his neighbor: this indeed is seuere, but no cruelty; its needfull and conuenient: *Conuenient*, because that seuerity iustly deserued by sin, is a bridle which keeps vs within compass, and makes vs feare sin; and experience teaches that though some who confess, do persеuere in their wickedness; yet generally such as make a good Confession are reclaim'd, and those that frequent this Sacrament, are the most reformed in their lyues. *Needfull* because that the Iudicature of consciences, and power of *binding* and *vnbinding* being giuen to the Priest; how can he exercyse that Iudicature, or know when, or what to bind, if the Penitent does not declare the state of his conscience, no more than a iudge in a secural tribunal can giue sentence, if he knows not the fact and circumstances of it: therefore said S. August. hom. 49. *Nemo dicat, occulte ago pœnitentiam, in corde meo ago, coram Deo ago, ergo sine causa dictum est quæ solueris.*

tis ſuper terram, &c. Let none ſay, I make penance priuatly, in my hart, in the ſight of God; in vain then vvas it ſaid, vvhatſoeuer ye ſhall vnbind, &c. And S. Auguſt alſo lib. de vera & falſa pœnitentia. *Conſideret qualitatem criminis, in loco, tempore, perſeuerantia & varietate perſonarum. Let him conſider the quality of the ſin, reflecting on the place, tyme, continuance, and diverſitie of Perſons.* You ſee Mr Sall, what a Confeſſion S. Auguſtin requires, of the ſin, of it's circumſtances. Which yet he more expresly declares, *l. 2. de Viſit. Infirmorum, c. 5. Aſtantem coram te Sacerdotem Angelum Dei exiſtima, aperi ei penenetralium tuorum abditiſſima latibula, nihil obſcurum dicens, culpam nullis ambagibus inuoluens, deſignanda ſunt in quibus peccaſti, loca, tempora, cum quibus perſonis, &c. Hæc autem omnia ſi tacentur, aut dicta callide pallientur animam iugulant. Looke on the Prieſt as on Gods Angel: diſcloſe to him the moſt hidden ſecrets of your hart; not ſpeaking obſcurely, nor telling your fault vvith vvheeling and vvinding expreſsions, declare the place, tyme, and perſons vvith vvhom; theſe if ſilenc'd, or craftily palliated, kill the ſoule.* Seueral other Fathers of the Church ſpeake no leſs pertinently to this purpoſe, but S. Auguſtin ſuffices for all.

The second thing wherin he accuses vs of cruelty in the exercyse of this Sacrament, is *the reseruation of cases not to be absolued but by certain Persons.* Which is so farr from being cruelty, that it appears to be most iust, either becauſe that euery priest is not so learned as to be able to manage the consciences of all people and therefore are iustly denied the exercyse of that power; or becauſe that som sins are so horrid that to withdraw men from them, it's very iust to restrain the power of forgiuing them, that by that restriction and difficulty men may be freighten'd.

The Third thing wherin he accuses vs of cruelty in this Sacrament, is that som Pastors make their flock belieue they cannot confess but to their own Curats, and extort by sordid auarice monies from them, for the Absolution. To this M Sall himself answers, wheras (quoth he) this is the fault of som corrupt members, and he will not cast the dirt of the feet of the Church vpon her face, and confess the Church to be so much an enemy to this practice, that there are Decrees of Councils and Pop's against it. M Sall if you did know that the Church is not guilty of this crime, but som corrupt members, why did you therefore

forſake the Church, but deteſt that abominable practice? becauſe, he ſayes, he did endeauour to reform the abuſe, and the perſons guilty were ſo haughty and headſtrong, that he could not preuayle: ſo that if he cannot reform what abuſes he finds in ſom members of the Proteſtant Church, he muſt alſo forſake her, and he muſt be of no congregation, but of that which has no corrupt members.

CONCLVSION.

Againſt the Third Point of Mr Salls diſcourſe.

MOnſtruous errors you ſay, obliged you to a ſeparation from the Catholick Church, (the vain pretext of hereticks of all ages, whoſe Names she has crushed to infamy, ſtill Triumphant againſt the Gates of Hell) and I muſt believe they were errors that obliged you, but imaginary only in her, and real in yourſelf we haue aſſerted her vnſpotted; and what renders you eternally criminal, is, that you know in your own conſcience, they were no errors of the Church, which you ſtile by that name: I ſay you know it well in your own conſcience; for you that was

ſo many years a Catholick, and a Profeſſor (as you ſay) in Scholaſtical and Moral Diuinity in Controuerſies, and what not? You could not but know that the Pop's ſupremacy in temporal affaires ouer Princes, was no article of our Faith; but a Schoolqueſtion denied by many Catholicks: you knew alſo the Pop's infallibility was but and opinion of ſom diuins and that what wee belieue as an article of Faith, is not the infallibility of the pope alone (of which only you ſpeake) but of the Church Vniuerſal, as it is diffuſed, or repreſentatiue in the Pope and Council together, was it not then knowen malice, and preiudice that made you recken as errors of the Church, theſe points, which are not Church Doctrin? was it not wicked and damnable in you to ſeparat from her for errors (if they be ſuch) which are not her errors, but of ſome or many Doctors? which you could haue denied, and not only remain a Catholick, but oblige Catholicks in refuting them!

But you had a mind to depart, and to render your ſeparation more acceptable to our Aduerſaries, you tooke for pretence thoſe two points, which though you know well they were no points of our Religion,

yet you knew they were very odious to our Aduersaries, and them you resolued to please vpon any account. was it not therefore that you exclaim against the Church of Rome saying tis but *a part of the Church, and not the Church Vniuersal.* pag. 24. as if you did not well know, that wee do not pleade for the Bishoprick of Rome, and that wee do confess it is but *a part* of the Church. Lastly you alleadge for a cause of your separation the forbidding of the Bible to the common people and the publick Prayers in an vnknowen language: in this your first Reformers erred damnably in departing, as you do, from the true Church for this cause; for nothing can iustify separation from the Church but errors and practices inconsistent with saluation, which as well our Diuins as yours do confess; and it is confessed by any man of common sense, that it is not needfull for saluation, (whatsoeuer you may say of its conueniency) to reade the Bible, or haue prayers in a knowen language: therefore that could be no iust cause of separation to them nor to you. But much more criminal are you than they in separating for that cause: for you had a sad experience (which they had not when they began) of the confusion and

multitude of ſects, occaſioned by the liberty granted to all people for the reading of Scripture: and therefore you were obliged rather to condemn that liberty than to aſſert it. You were forc'd to forſake our Church, you ſay for her errors: but S. Auguſtin tells you (*lib. cont. Parmen. c.* 11.) *there is no iuſt neceſsity to diuide Vnity*, and epiſt. 48. *It is impoſsible that any may haue a iuſt cauſe to forſake the communion of the Church.* Our Church therefore, which was the only Church extant before, and in Luthers dayes, and is now the ſame that then it was, had no errors which might be a *iuſt cauſe*, or *neceſsity* for him, or for you to depart from her, and *deuide Vnity* of Religion. If her errors, wherof you accuſe her, are *fundamental* errors inconſiſtent with ſaluation; then there may be a *iuſt neceſsity* and cauſe to ſeparat from the Church, which S. Auguſtin abſolutly denies; if they were but ſmale, inferior and not fundamental errors, as generally all ſectaries ſay, then there is a iuſt neceſſity alſo to ſeparat from all Congregations and Churches in the world; ſince that in the opinion of all Sectaries, there is no Church or Congregation free from ſome inferior and not fundamental errors, the Proteſtants accuſe

the Catholicks of many, the Presbyterians accuſe the Proteſtants, the Anabaptiſts accuſe the Presbyterians, and ſo of all the reſt.

And is it not a pretty ieſt that you would make vn believe, it's the deſire of ſecurity of your ſaluation, which forced you to ſeparat from the Roman Church, wherin S. Thomas Aquinas dyed, who in the acknowledgement of your own Doctors is a *Saint*, where S. Bernard dyed, who in the iudgment of your own Doctors was a *Saint* ſaies your whitaker de Eccl. pag. 369. *a very pious Man*, ſaies your Oſiander cent. 12. a *Saint of the Roman Church* ſaies your Gomarus in ſpeculo Eccl. p. 23. *one of the lamps of Gods Church*, ſaies your Paſquil in his Return to Eng. pag. 8. could not you ſecure your ſaluation in that Church wherin S. Gregory the Great, dyed and liued a Pope, *that Bleſſed and Holy Father*, ſaies your Godwin, in his Catal. of Bish. pag. 3. *that holy and learned Bishop of Rome* ſaies Mr Bell in his *Suruey of Pop.* pag. 189. theſe haue been, as your Authors freely confeſs, of the Roman Church, and haue been great Saints; and, I hope, you are not ſo impious as to deny that Xauerius that grat Apoſtle of the Indies, S. Dominik, S. Francis, and S. Igna-

tius were Saints, nor so impudent as deny that they were of our Church. And can wee believe that you were forced for to secure your salvation to forsake that Church, wherin these have not only be saved, but dyed *Saints*, for the Protestant Church, wherof there was never yet any Saint. Let vs suppose, that both the Catholick and Protestant Church is a saving Church; yet for to secure his salvation will not any wyse man, rather chuse that Church wherin there are so many Saints than a Church which never yet afforded any? as you would chuse to study in schoole, where many learned Doctors are bred, rather than in a schoole, where never any learned man was knowen. what wyse man, tender of his salvation, would not chuse that Church and Religion, which generally all persons who know both Religions, do chuse to dye in? for, certainly, the election of that last houre, when men are most earnest to secure their salvation, and setting interest and Pleasures asyde, end endeavour to provide for eternity, is a great argument of the goodness of a Religion: that Church therefore wherin generally all men, who know both Religions, chuse to dye in, ought to be embraced by him who

endeauors

endeauors to ſecure his ſaluation; This is the Catholick Religion; for there haue been many who being born and bred Catholick, flincht to the Proteſtant Religion; there haue been many alſo who being born and bred Proteſtants, were conuerted to the Catholick Religion; and thus they knew both Religions; and what Man did you euer heare of, who becoming from a Proteſtant to be a Catholick, and liued ſo vntill his dying houre, that deſired to dye a Proteſtant, or called for a Miniſter to be reconciled to the Church? but to the contrary, generally all thoſe who of Catholicks become Proteſtants, and liue ſo vntill their dying hour, then they call for a Prieſt, for to be reconciled to the Catholick Church, then they dye, or deſire to dye Catholicks and wee know by many experiences, that the friends of thoſe dying Perſons do watch the doores, to hinder the acceſs of any Prieſt: is not this a ſtrong proof, that it is not deuotion made them become Proteſtants, and that the Catholick Religion is the ſecureſt for ſaluation? did you deſire to ſecure your ſaluation? why did not you obſerue what Counſel Chriſt gaue vs for to be ſaued with aduantage, and then you would

know which Religion to chuſe? Conſider how much did Chriſt recommend vnto vs voluntary Powerty, *if thou vvilt be perfect* (ſayd he Mat. 19 21.) *go and ſell vvhat thou haſt, and giue it to the poor.* And in the ſame chap. exhorts vs *to forſake Eſtats, Lands, houſes &c.* for his ſaxe; this has been practis'd by the Primitiue Chriſtians Act. 5. in our Church Kings, Princes, Noble Men, and rich men haue followed this Doctrin: I confeſs many of our Church do not follow it, but the quite contrary, but the Doctrin is not only practis'd by many, but the Church exhorts the Faithfull vnto it, and that to great effect, wheras our Conuents and Monaſteries are inhabited by many who changed their plenifull eſtates for, powerty, their Silks end ſattins for rags, their delicat dishs for a fryers portion, their liberty for retyrement, and their wordly pleaſures for a continual mortification: you know this to be true, who knows the Order of the *Carthuſians*, to ſpeake nothing of other religious orders. how much the Proteſtant Church is a ſtranger to this Doctrin and practiſe, the world knows: what Proteſtant did you euer hear of, that forſook a plentifull eſtate to become a poor Miniſter? did euer any Miniſter

or Preacher of your Church exhort his flock to this practise, or would not he be esteemed a Mad man, that would do it? How then Mr Sall? did you for to secure your saluation, chuse that Church, where this Counsel of Christ is neglected, and which laughs at vs for following it? did you for to secure your saluation, forsake powerty which Criſt recommended as a means to be saued, and to which you were by *solemn vow* obliged, and go to a Church where you may haue, and does expect to be rich, Christ hauing branded Richs as dangerous to saluation? This manner of securing salnation was euer yet vnknowen to all Saints, who esteemed Richs and Honors sworn enemyes to the soule; they to secure their saluation, forsook Richs and Honnors, and you to secure yours, you forsake powerty (Powerty I say to which youare obliged by solemn vow) and seek for Richs.

Had you changed the Catholick Religion for an other more austere wee might belieue, that your aim was to secure your saluation; for Christ recommended Austerity of lyfe, and the mortification of our flesh and senses, as a most powerfull means for to ouercom vice. I doubt not but that there are many Libertins in our Church,

who do indulge and cherish their Bodyes too much to the preiudice of their ſouls; but look to the Doctrin and Maxims of the Church; Pennance, auſterity of lyfe, mortifications of the Body is not only taught, as good and aduantagious to the ſoul; but is practis'd by innumerable Catholicks of all ſexes, ages and conditions in diſciplins, hair-cloaths, faſting sleeping on the bare ground ryſing at midnight for to prayſe God, abſtaining from delicat meats and wearing of Linnen and ſeueral other chaſtiſements of the Body; Chriſt has recommended this auſterity of lyfe, and Corporal mortifications by S. Paul 1. Cor 9. 17 the great Baptiſt did practiſe them Mar. 1. the Prophet Dauid pſ. 148. S. Paul himſelf, and all the ſaints of the Primitiue Church; and the Church did euer yet eſteem theſe means very powerfull for to purchaſe virtue and ouercom vice; and you to ſecure your ſaluation, you haue forſaken the Church, where this Doctrin is taught, and practis'd, for the Proteſtant Church; did you euer heare of any Proteſtant, who diſciplins himſelf, who sleeps on the bare ground, who ryſes at midnight to ſing pſalms to God, who abſtains from wearing of Linnen? I do not wonder that many Libertins of

your Church, should set these exercises at naught, but that the whole Body of that Church by their Doctrin and Principles should condemn them, as fruitless, Idle, nay and iniurious to Christ's Passion: is this the Church Mr Sall, which you haue chusen for to secure your saluation? a Church whose Doctrin is so carnal, which will not smart the flesh, but cherish the Body? it's lykly indeed that your aim was, in your change of Religion, to secure your saluation; when you left a Religion where you in particular, were obliged to Austerity for a Religion, which obliges you to none, but to enioy pleasures; a Religion where you were by vow obliged to Powerty, for a Religion where you expect to be, and may be rich; a Religion where by your Profession you were incapable of Honors, for one where you may haue Preferments. No Mr Sall, you will not perswade the world, that it was any aduantage to your soul which moued you: your resolution will appeare to any impartial man, to be uniust and damnable, and attended particularly in you, by innumerable sins; for though the Precepts of the Church, of fasting, annual Confession and Communion, and keeping Holy dayes, reach not to obli-

ge Proteſtants who are ſuch by education; but it's out of controuerſy that they oblige you, to whom her Power for commanding, and your obligation of obeying, is ſufficiently knowen; wherfore there is not a faſting day which you infring, an Annual Confeſſion which you omit an Eaſter Communion that you neglect, or a holy day Maſs, but you commit a haynous ſin. Reflect on theſe monſtruous effects of your reſolution; and amuſe not your ſelf with the hopes that you will be of the number of them, who at the laſt hour will be reclaim'd, and call for a Prieſt to be reconcil'd. It's our duty to beſeech God he may be ſo mercifull vnto you; but it's yours not to abuſe Gods patience, leaſt that in punishment of not anſwering now to his inſpirations, you may heare then thoſe dreadfull words of the Prouerbs ch. 1. v. 24. *I haue called and ye refuſed-ye haue ſet at naught my Counſels, and vvould none of my reproof: I alſo vvill laugh at your calamity; I vvill mock vvhen your feare cometh-Then ſhall you call vpon me, but I vvill not anſvver, they ſhall ſeek me earneſtly, but they ſhall not find me, for that they had knovvledg and did not chuſe the fear of the Lord.*

FINIS.